Compliments of the author

Sam'l J. Trudell

1.17.11

Library of the Theological Seminary

PRINCETON, N. J.

From the Library of
Dr. James McCosh.

Division BS1415

Section .8.T86

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 17 1911
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A

Wonderful Discovery

IN

The Book of Job.

BEHEMOTH AND LEVIATHAN

Found to Refer to

The Stationary and Self-propelling

STEAM ENGINES

OF OUR DAYS,

BY

SAMUEL O. TRUDELL.

PHILADELPHIA:
AVIL PRINTING CO., 3941-43-45 MARKET ST.,
1890.

COPYRIGHT, 1890.

All Rights Reserved.

TO

OUR RAILROAD AND STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

THIS BOOK

IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.

PREFACE.

In this age of wonderful discoveries when the *impossible* seems to be a thing of the past, and the *unknowable* but a word which is daily losing its meaning, I hope I will not be considered presumptuous for claiming to have discovered, in the Holy Bible, a most extraordinary and exact description of our modern steam engine, with details of its various parts and of many of its peculiar characteristics.

The description I allude to is, that of the *behemoth* and *leviathan*, found in the latter part of that most ancient book called THE BOOK OF JOB.

Job, is said to have been a descendant of Esau, and to have lived in the land of Uz, near the borders of Arabia.

Chronologists do not agree as to the exact time in which he lived, but it may be safely computed to have been about 3500 years ago. He is represented as having been a most righteous and learned man; and to have experienced many severe trials and acute sufferings, with an unparalleled patience and resignation to the will of God.

Towards the last of his trials, when even his

friends had become his persecutors, the Lord Himself appears unto Job and consoles him by rebuking his enemies, and, as a vindication of his words and conduct, shows him many of the wondrous works of creation, and, among other things, calls his special attention to two most wonderful and powerfully built monsters called, BEHEMOTH, and LEVIATHAN.

Up to the present the name, as well as the individuality of these supposed *animals*, has been problematical.

Our greatest exegetists, after having written volumes on this subject, have been forced to acknowledge that, after all their careful investigations, they entertained serious doubts as to what *behemoth* or *leviathan* was.

The book of Job, and especially the description of these monsters, is conceded to be the most difficult and mysterious of any in the Hebrew Bible.

Many have supposed Job to be but a fictitious personage, and have taken special advantage of the many extraordinary assertions concerning these monsters, to prove that they were fabulous, and could have had no possible existence except in the mind of the superstitious and ignorant.

To this I would say that, I am confident of having found the key to this most ancient and most extraordinary prophecy, and of being able to show that, far from being fabulous, these fiery monsters are in our very midst this day, full of life and power, and faithfully administering to our pleasures and daily wants.

In order to afford the reader a ready means of investigating for himself, and at the same time to avoid, as much as possible, too frequent quotations in the body of the work, I thought it well to place at the beginning of my review of each verse, the full text in Hebrew and Latin, then the English version. Opposite each Hebrew word will be found my own literal rendering of it, followed by that given to the same word by the Vulgate. Thus the student will have prominently before him, a ready means of comparing my own translation with the original, and with the Latin and English versions.

I will occasionally refer to important passages in the Greek version of the Septuagint, and quote from well-known authors on the subject, as the case may require.

I have avoided, as far as the scope of this work would allow, all lengthy expositions or discussions which are not of absolute importance to a fair elucidation of the point in question, and of all such grammatical explanations as would be of no interest to the general reader.

As none of our versions of the original text are considered to have been inspired, the reader will understand that, the remarks and criticisms which I have found it necessary to make, concerning the renderings of certain difficult passages in old and time-honored versions, are not intended to cast the least shadow of a doubt upon the inspiration of the original text, nor to be considered as a want of respect either for these va-

uable works or their authors, to whom I feel much indebted for the elucidation of many difficult points.

In order to make my translations and comments harmonize better with the reading of the original and with that of various versions of it, I have found it necessary to adopt the masculine gender, instead of the feminine, which is generally made use of in speaking of the locomotive or engine.

I trust that my humble efforts will add to the joy of all who believe in the inspired word of God and of His Prophets.

May the ancient Sons of Israel be proud that their ancestors have handed down to us, so intact, such an extraordinary document.

A WONDERFUL DISCOVERY

IN

THE BOOK OF JOB.

During leisure hours, some twelve years past, while searching for a key to the mysteries of the revelations of St. John, I came to the great "Sea Dragon," with many heads and horns.

I had followed up, throughout the Bible, a number of passages in which mention was made of some such monster, when I came to the description, in the Book of Job, of the mysterious *Behemoth and Leviathan.*

The more I pondered over the singular description of these monsters, the more I became convinced that it applied to some creatures with far greater power and qualities than flesh and blood are generally heir to.

I was astonished to find that the bones of the behemoth were said to be *tubes of brass* and *bars of iron;* and that, contrary to all other animals, his strength depended on the *firmness of his flanks.* I wondered that it should be said of an animal that "his breath kindles coals of fire;" and, "through his nostrils goes forth smoke as from a pot of water heated and boiling."

This direct reference to *steam* struck me at

once as the probable solution of the mystery. I pursued this idea throughout the description, and was greatly surprised at the many points of similarity existing between these monsters and our modern steam engine, specially when it is said of the leviathan that "through his mouth leap forth flames and sparks of fire," and further on, where the same monster is represented as *causing the deep sea to boil like a pot.*

The reference of these passages respectively to the steam locomotive and to the steamship seemed quite evident to me.

I subsequently read over the works of several commentators on this description; but, to my surprise and dismay, I did not find a single word in their learned and elaborate works which might corroborate my views or encourage me to pursue any further my new ideas.

Later on I procured the Greek version of the Septuagint, and found that their interpretation of several difficult passages greatly favored my views, specially where they mention that the leviathan *turns, or propels himself.* (xli. 25.)

But in order to decide for myself between a variety of opinions and translations which could not be otherwise than biased by the preconceived ideas of the various authors, I found it absolutely necessary to acquire some knowledge of the Hebrew, being the original language in which this description was written.

After having carefully read over the original, and closely investigated the meaning of each word,

I became convinced that both descriptions referred to our modern steam power in its various applications.

That the reader may have an idea of the uncertainty which has, up to the present, existed as to the nature of the so-called behemoth, I will quote a variety of conjectures concerning the individuality of this monster.

Albert Barnes, in his notes (Vol. II. p. 267), says: "A variety of opinions has been entertained in regard to the animal referred to here, though the *main* inquiry has related to the question whether the *elephant* or the *hippopotamus* is denoted. Since the times of Bochart, who has gone into an extended examination of the subject (Hieroz. P. ii. L. ii. c. xv.), the common opinion has been that the latter is here referred to. As a *specimen* of the method of interpreting the Bible which has prevailed, and as a proof of the slow progress which has been made towards settling the meaning of a difficult passage, we may refer to some of the opinions which have been entertained in regard to this animal. They are chiefly taken from the collection of opinions made by Schultens, in loco. Among them are the following:

"1. That wild animals in general are denoted. This appears to have been the opinion of the translators of the Septuagint.

"2. Some of the Rabbins suppose that a huge monster was referred to, that ate every day 'the grass of a thousand mountains.'

"3. It has been held by some that the wild bull

was here meant. Sanctius, particularly, entertained this view.

"4. The common opinion, until the times of Bochart, has been that the elephant was meant. See the particular authors who have held this opinion enumerated in Schultens.

"5. Bochart, maintained, and since his time the opinion has been generally acquiesced in, that the *river-horse* of the Nile, or the hippopotamus, was the one intended. This opinion he has defended at length in Hieroz. P. ii. L. v. c. xv.

"6. Others have held that some 'hieroglyphic monster' was represented, or that the whole description was an emblematic representation, though without any living original.

"Among those who held this sentiment, some have supposed that it is designed to be emblematic of the old serpent; others, of the corrupt and fallen nature of man; others, that the proud, the cruel, and the bloody are denoted; some of the 'Fathers' supposed that the devil was here emblematically represented by the behemoth and leviathan; and one writer has maintained that it had reference to Christ."

To these may be added the more recent opinion, that the behemoth here described is at present a genus altogether extinct, like the mammoth, and other animals that have been discovered in fossil remains.

It is evident, from the conflicting views of these learned doctors, that there must be something very mysterious and extraordinary about the behemoth of Job.

Even later commentators do not seem to have made any progress towards solving this most ancient problem.

Adam Clarke, in his well known commentary (Vol. II. p. 108), alluding to the name and individuality of behemoth, remarks that "from the *name*, or the understanding had of it by the ancient versions, we can derive no assistance relative to the individuality of the animal in question; and can only hope to find what it is by the characteristics it bears in the description here given of it.

"These having been carefully considered, and deeply investigated, both critics and naturalists have been led to the conclusion that either the *elephant*, or the hippopotamus or *river-horse*, is the animal in question; and, on comparing the characteristics between these two, the balance is considerably in favor of the hippopotamus. But even here there are still some difficulties, as there are some parts of the description which do not well suit even the *hippopotamus;* and, therefore, I have my doubts whether *either* of the animals above is that in question, or whether any animal now in existence be that described by the Almighty."

The great objection to the above animals being the ones alluded to, is, that their tails are remarkably short, only about a foot long, whilst that of the behemoth is said to be enormous, resembling a tall cedar tree.

In its proper place I will show to what this enormous tail refers, and how natural and necessary it is to our modern behemoth.

As to the *leviathan*, there has been no less conjecture, concerning its name and identity, than of those of behemoth.

As its name was never satisfactorily explained, most versions retained the original Hebrew word. The Septuagint, though, rendered it *dragon*. It might be well to remark here that, in almost all languages, the word *dragon* means *a fiery monster*.

It is certainly a name that would suit well the characteristics of the one here described. As to its personal identity, some have supposed it to be a huge serpent, described in ancient fables, whose head would meet its tail around the earth.

I can now see a great deal of probability in this supposed fable, if it be but interpreted of *steam*. For the steamships and the steam railroads have, indeed, girdled the earth.

Others look upon the leviathan as some monster whale, or some ferocious creature of the deep. Even monsters of wickedness have been supposed to be alluded to here.

Up to the present, the crocodile has been looked upon as the one most probably referred to, on account of possessing more of the required characteristics.

Adam Clarke, after a serious and impartial consideration of the subject, says: "After all, what is *leviathan?* I have strong doubts whether either *whale* or *crocodile* be meant.

"I think even the crocodile overrated by this description. He is too great, two powerful, too important in this description. No beast, terrestrial

or aquatic, deserves the high character here given; though that character considers him as unconquerably strong, ferociously cruel, and wonderfully made.

"Perhaps *leviathan* was some extinct *mammoth* of the *waters*, as *behemoth* was of the land. However I have followed the general opinion by treating him as the *crocodile* throughout these notes; but could not finish without stating my doubts on this subject; though I have nothing better to offer in the place of the animal in behalf of which almost all learned men and critics argue, and concerning which they generally agree. As to its being an emblem either of *Pharaoh*, or the *devil*, I can say little more than, I doubt.

"The description is extremely dignified; and, were we sure of the animal, I have no doubt we should find it in every instance correct.

"But after all that has been said, we have yet to to learn *what* leviathan is."

According, then, to the opinion of this learned commentator, *we have yet to learn* WHAT leviathan is.

Moreover it would be well to take particular notice of his important conclusion, that, *were we sure of the animal, we should find the description in every instance correct.*

It is upon this very point of *exact correspondence* to the original description, that I base the exclusive right of the steam engine to the claim of being the behemoth and leviathan therein referred to.

BEHEMOTH CONSUMES FOOD AS WELL AS CATTLE DO.

Job xl. 15.

הִנֵּה־נָא	Behold now *one*	Ecce
בְּהֵמוֹת (בְּחִ...)	with ragings—great heat,	behemoth
אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי	which I made *to be*	quem feci
עִמָּךְ	with thee ;	tecum ;
חָצִיר	hay, fodder	fœnum
כַּבָּקָר	as well as cattle	quasi bos
יֹאכֵל׃	he, or it, will consume,—eat.	comedet.

"Behold now behemoth, which I have made with thee : he eateth grass as an ox."

THIS verse, in the present Hebrew Bible, is numbered the fifteenth, but the same enumeration has not been adopted by all versions.

The entire description, relating to *behemoth* and *leviathan*, is contained in forty-four consecutive verses, and is the most extraordinary and elaborate one of the kind to be found in the Bible ; and, up to the present, has proved the most difficult as well as the most incomprehensible of inspired writings.

Most of its difficulties, though, will be found to be due to the forced construction which had to be adopted in order to make the words of the original suit the animals supposed to be referred to.

In our English translations, the word *behemoth* stands as it does in the original Hebrew; but there is no good reason for this other than a means of evading the responsibility of translating it *cattle;* this, expositors have readily noticed, would not agree with the wording of this verse, nor with what is said in subsequent verses concerning the nature and extraordinary powers of the one therein described. Neither have they ventured to render the word (בְּהֵמוֹת) *behemoth*, by *a great beast*, as a *pluralis excellentiæ*, for the reason that the Lord would certainly not give such a wonderful description of an animal without calling it by its proper name, as He had all others to which He had referred in the verses immediately preceding this. Moreover, by giving to this powerful creature the common appellation of *beast*, it would virtually be leaving this most extraordinary one without a name; for nowhere else in this description can a word be found which might be indicative of its name. Therefore, the shortest way out of this dilemma was to retain, as the name of this supposed creature, a word which seemed intended to indicate the species to which he belonged, but which, evidently, had no intelligible meaning to expositors.

The same reasons, undoubtedly, led them to retain the original Hebrew word *leviathan* (chap. xli. 1), as its real meaning—one coupled together—seemed to them inapplicable. Therefore, they made this verse the beginning of a new description, and supposed that it referred to a different animal,

although there is certainly nothing more to warrant it than the difficulty of the word, which is a compound one.

It is evident that the names of these two extraordinary monsters have been, up to the present, as much of a mystery as the nature of the creatures themselves.

With one or two exceptions, exegetists agree that what is here said under the head of *behemoth* refers to but one animal or species of animals. Nevertheless, some have endeavored to show that it must refer to several species of animals; but this is only on account of the difficulty they have experienced in finding any one animal which could have possessed at once such various and wonderful attributes.

Most translators have retained the original word *behemoth*, such as the Syriac, Arabic, Vulgate; but the Septuagint translate it by (θηρια) *theria*, which denotes generally *a wild beast*. The Chaldee has *creature* or *beast*, in general. Prof. Lee renders it *beasts*. Umbreit supposes that it means *Nile-horse*. In the marginal reading of certain manuscripts the word *elephant* is added by way of interpretation.

From the above, one can judge of the difficulty which has been experienced in comprehending this word, and rendering it suitably to the context.

The word (בְּהֵמוֹת) *behemoth*, taken as the plural of (בְּהֵמָה) *behemah*, is a collective noun. It is often met with in the scriptures, and denotes domestic cattle, such as the ox, the horse, the ass. It is sometimes poetically used in connection with

(הָאָרֶץ) *haarets*, and then refers to *beasts of the field*, *wild beasts;* but there is nothing to show that, in this instance, it might have been intended in this sense.

If this word *behemoth* be derived from *behemah*, it becomes difficult to understand why a collective name of such wide application should be used here, when the entire description is evidently of some peculiar and powerful monster. Then again this word never occurs elsewhere as a proper noun. Even if it be taken as a *pluralis excellentiæ*, it is still objectionable, for it leaves this creature without a name, whilst this is the only word which all versions seem to look to as intended to indicate the species or name of this supposed animal.

It is thought by some that, under the form *behemoth*, there lies concealed some Egyptian name for the hippopotamus, so modified as to put on the appearance of a Semitic word. Thus *P-ehe-mout* would signify *the water-ox*.

Undoubtedly the word must have some appropriate meaning, but we can derive no benefit from such mere conjectures.

As to the word *behemoth* referring but to one animal, may be strongly inferred from the verb *to eat*, being in the third person singular, *he will eat*. In subsequent verses the pronouns are also in the singular.

Neither can a plurality of animals be satisfactorily established from any expression which occurs in any of the forty-four verses of this description. That he is represented, now among the wild beasts

of the field, then as ploughing the deep, does not prove conclusively that two distinct animals are meant; neither will the wording of the context favor any such a supposition, but rather that some amphibious monster is referred to. I have reference here to both behemoth and leviathan. There are passages, in the description of the one as well as of the other, that prove beyond a doubt, according to their present interpretation, that both were aquatic, and that both went on land. For instance, the twenty-third verse of the present chapter reads, "Behold, he drinketh a river, and hasteth not; he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth." This verse, taken in the same sense as the majority of expositors have, viz.: that he would not be moved though an impetuous torrent rushed over his mouth, is good evidence that this monster did not fear the water, not even an impetuous torrent.

The following verse may be quoted to show that he roams about on land also: "Surely the mountains bring him forth food, where all the beasts of the field play (xl. 20)."

Numerous passages could be quoted from the forty-first chapter to prove that leviathan also is aquatic, but it will be sufficient to refer to the thirty-first verse; "He maketh the deep to boil like a pot; he maketh the sea like a pot of ointment."

As a land animal it is said of him, in the thirty-third verse: "Upon earth there is not his like, who is made without fear." From this it would appear that he was more formidable on the earth (lit upon

the dust), than in the sea, as it is asserted that "*upon the earth* there is not his like," whilst nothing is said of his being the most formidable in the sea.

From these few passages it would seem evident, then, that both behemoth and leviathan were amphibious; a rather strange coincidence, that the two greatest and strongest creatures should be amphibious.

But a stranger fact still, and a further proof of the oneness of this description is, that there does not occur one single word, in either of these (supposed) two descriptions, which would tend to show that these creatures were dissimilar in any of their main features. For instance, it is said that behemoth consumes hay or fodder as well as cattle do, whilst it is not affirmed that the leviathan feeds on anything different, as fish, or flesh, for instance.

The bones of the behemoth are said to be *bars of iron;* and *tubes like copper;* and his tail is likened to a tall cedar tree. But nothing is said to the contrary of the bones nor of the tail of the leviathan. If he were a separate and distinct animal, we would undoubtedly find some of his corresponding parts also described, that his superiority in beauty or strength might be known. As the description stands, it would be difficult for any one to show in what the one differed from the other.

Under the supposition that two distinct animals are meant, it would also be hard to reconcile what is said of behemoth (xl. 19): "He is chief of the ways of God,"—with what is asserted of leviathan, that "upon earth there is not his like." (xli. 33).

These mysteries, however, are easily solved when we look upon the so-called *behemoth* and *leviathan* as referring to but one powerful monster, such as our modern steam engine, which is also capable of running on land as well as in the deep sea; and that the word *leviathan* does not designate a different creature, but is simply a compound word meaning (as all writers on the subject explain), one *linked* or *coupled together*, and denoting one of the many characteristics of the behemoth, or the same steam engine in the shape of a locomotive or self-propelling machine capable of being *linked* or *coupled* to other parts.

These points will be elucidated at length as I proceed with the exposition of each verse.

Having thus given a brief insight as to the reference of this entire description, I will proceed with a closer investigation into the difficulties of each verse.

As to the proper meaning of the word *behemoth*, I have reasoned thus. If it be the name of the monster referred to in this description, and if the Lord Himself gave it this name, then, according to all precedents in similar cases, it must be a name which indicates some of its prominent characteristics, or the purposes to which it was adapted. That it is intended to designate the monster referred to in this description, there can hardly be any doubt; all expositors, without any exception, having so decided.

That this name—as well as this entire description—has been given by the Lord Himself, we can

find no reasonable grounds for a supposition to the contrary, whilst we possess strong evidence in its favor, viz., (1) The statement of the writer of the book of Job, who says that the Lord spoke unto Job out of the whirlwind. (2) The fact that in the words attributed to the Lord occur numerous and extraordinary revelations which, in those days, could not possibly have been known to Job or his ancestors, without a direct revelation from God, such as the suspension of our globe in space without a foundation, which fact can be reasonably inferred from chapter xxxviii. 6.

In the same chapter, verse fourteenth, the rotation of the earth and its garment of clouds are clearly indicated as being like *a seal of clay rotating on itself; and they* (the noxious vapors, mentioned in the previous verse), *standing as a garment.*

(3.) This extraordinary revelation itself, concerns a most modern and most extraordinary piece of mechanism, the steam engine, which, when its identity has been established, will constitute sufficient proof in itself that such a thing could not have been known to men in those days without a direct revelation from God.

As to precedents in similar cases, where the Lord has given names indicating some prominent characteristic of the person or thing He named, I would refer to the Bible, which is full of such instances. Adam is so called on account of his color being *red* or *ruddy*. Eve's name designates her as "the mother of the living." Abraham is so called because he

was destined to be "the father of a multitude," and *Israel*, because "he prevails with God." And as an example of the prevalence of calling animals by names which indicate some of their characteristics, I would mention the name of the ox, which, in Hebrew is, collectively, bakar (בָּקָר) meaning, primarily, *to plough*, as in those days the ox was used to plough.

Even the Indians in America name, not only animals, but also their children, from certain personal peculiarities, or from incidents of their birth or youth.

Thus, from this most ancient rule with the Lord and with men, I would conclude that the God-given name *behemoth*, must carry within itself indications of some of the most prominent characteristics of the monster intended.

As we have before us a most complete description of the extraordinary powers and peculiar habits of this wonderful creature, it will not be hard to decide what its most prominent characteristics are; then we will be better able to see whether some of the meanings of the word *behemoth* can be found to correspond to any of them.

The most striking peculiarities of this creature, such as would make an immediate impression upon the mind of an unprejudiced reader of the original, would be the repeated description of *fire* and *flames* emanating from him. For instance in chapter xli. 18 to 22d verse we read: "With his neesings a light doth shine, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning." "From his mouth

flames will leap forth, and sparks of fire will escape." "Out of his nostrils will issue forth smoke, as out of a boiling pot or caldron." "His inhaling kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth." He is also repeatedly represented as being full of ragings and internal commotions. Then his various parts, which are said to be *tubes of brass*, *bars of iron* and *impenetrable shields*, closely unitedthe one to the other; all of which should have secured for it, from the Lord, a name far more appropriate than the common appellation of *cattle* or *beasts*.

Reasoning on the strength of the above, I feel convinced that the word *behemoth* must have some mysterious signification; or that possibly the original word, either from inadvertency, or from the doubtful or obliterated form of some of its characters, may have been changed to its present reading.

I would suppose, as the most plausible solution of this difficult problem, that here the letter (ח) *cheth*, was mistaken for the letter (ה) *he;* and that the original reading of this word was, (בְּחֵמוֹת) *be-chemoth*.

I would take *beth* here as the prefix preposition, *with;* and *chemoth* as the plural of *chemah*, meaning *heat*, *anger*, *rage* or *wrath*.

According to this the original would have meant; Behold now *one* with ragings, or, one full of violent ragings, full of great heat or warmth.

Here the plural form of the word would seem intended to indicate either the intensity or the va-

riety of this heat, or wrath; so that the sense may be, either that he was filled with intense heat, or with various kinds of heat; or, with violent wrath, or with a variety of ragings.

Either or all these meanings of the word, as you will recognize, correspond in a wonderful manner with some of the most prominent characteristics of this monster as shown above, and corroborates so fully the proposition which I have advanced, that names given by the Lord himself are always found to designate some prominent characteristics of the person or thing named, that it almost amounts to a proof that the correction which I propose restores, indeed, the word *behemoth* to its original form and meaning, viz., *bechemoth*, one having within it violent ragings, intense heat. These same *ragings* seem to be clearly referred to in the verse just quoted above, where, speaking of his rage as manifested through his nostrils, he says: "Out of his nostrils will issue forth smoke, as out of a boiling pot or caldron." This may be taken as a clear manifestation of both great heat and great anger.

Let us now see how these various meanings of the word *bechemoth* would apply to our modern steaming monster.

No one will deny that he is full of terrific ragings, and intense heat. His pent-up forces escape with fearful rage; and, at times, he roars most terrifically. Surely there is also enough *heat* in him to account for the Hebrew word being in the plural, (chemoth). It is *heated* steam that issues from his nostrils; his flanks are filled with *heated* water;

his whole body is *burning hot*, and his very food is *burning coals* of fire fanned by his own breath.

Thus it would seem that the meaning of the word *bechemoth*, not only suits the main characteristics of the monster of Job, but corresponds in an extraordinary manner with those of our modern monster of power.

The next difficulty which occurs in this verse, is the phrase "which I made with thee." It has given rise to many conjectures, and almost every exponent of the passage has had a different view of its meaning.

The Vulgate renders it "quem feci tecum," the same as above. The Septuagint leave out the verb, and render the entire passage by "παρα σοι" —near thee. It is possible that the Septuagint had some objections to the verb and preferred not to express it, as it does not mean *to create*, but simply *to make*, *to construct*, which might not have been consistent with their views, which probably were that this monster had been *created* as well as all animals. As it stands in the Greek it leaves a wider range to the translator, and would suit my views better than some of our late translations. Barnes translates—"which I have made as well as thyself"—that is, either "I have made him as well as you, have formed him to be a fellow creature with thee," or "I have made him *near* thee;" to wit, in Egypt.

Prof. Lee, viewing this description as referring to various species of animals distributively, translates; "Behold now *the* beasts which I have

made *are* with thee, . . ." In subsequent remarks on the expression "with thee," he says: "The phrase (עָשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ) *asithi immake*, will not bear the sense ascribed to it by Bochart; First, because *feci tecum*, in that sense, cannot be shown to be Hebrew; and, secondly, because none of the passages adduced . . . . either exhibits *that phraseology*, or anything like it. For, *to make* or *create* anything *with another*, must mean one of these two things; (1) Either to do this in society with another so that he be present with the action; which is impossible here; or (2) *to make, or create* anything so that it may be or *remain with* another; and this I take to be the sense intended. In that sense, *to create with*, would supply no sense adequate to that intended by the original. It is, consequently, a false translation. I have therefore translated the passage 'are with thee;' i. e., in thy neighborhood, and familiar to thy sight. In this sense I have no objection to adopt the 'prope' or 'juxta' of Bochart, in rendering it; although I claim the privilege of separating עָשִׂיתִי *asithi* from עִמָּךְ *immake* by the term 'are' by which a regular phraseology is restored. In this case, too, we are not compelled to recur to the Nile exclusively to find the hippopotamus, but may take in the horse, the mule, the ass, the wild ass or horse, the hippopotamus, and, indeed, every other animal which is graminivorous, and answers the descriptions severally given."

I have referred to the above author because I concur with him in his views of the meaning of the

expression "with thee;" for this passage could not certainly be intended to mean that God had made this monster with Job, that is, either at the same time or in company with him; but made it *to be with him* as a companion or helpmate. We cannot interpret this, though, as meaning that he was made to be exclusively with Job, but with mankind in general. One of the primary meanings of the word is *help* or *aid* to any one.

This view of the meaning of this passage is certainly quite applicable to the steam engine; for it is undisputedly one of the greatest and most powerful helpmates ever made for man.

Undoubtedly the chief reason which deterred expositors from interpreting the word in the sense of a helpmate "for thee," was the drift of the description which proves this monster to be of a most terrible and fiery character.

But this, otherwise reasonable objection, is found to disappear when we look upon our modern monster of power as this terrible one. Moreover this view of it is just what is required to fully illustrate the difficulty of this passage; for, otherwise, why should the Lord have said that He had made this creature *with* Job, or with man, any more than the other animals he had made?

Ferocious monsters, such as are supposed to be referred to here, cannot be said to have been made *for* man, nor made to be *with* him.

Surely the good man Job would not have appreciated the compliment had he known that the most hideous of all monsters—the hippopotamus—

was, of all others, the one that the Lord had more specially created *with* him, according to Bochart.

Although the Lord seems to address Himself to Job throughout this description, yet it cannot be supposed that he is exclusively meant, but rather all mankind, of which he here stood as a representative. In proof of this I would refer to the evident meaning of the word just explained, and also to chap. xli. 5, where the Lord, addressing Job, says: "Wilt thou bind (harness) him for thy maidens?" whilst Job's maidens were then all dead. Evidently the meaning of this passage is: 'Will man bind him for his maidens?' or, is he such a reliable creature that man will harness him up as a plaything for his children? It is not necessary, therefore, to suppose that Job was well acquainted with the behemoth, or with the leviathan, as some writers suppose. I look on it as probable, though, that Job saw the behemoth at the moment the Lord said to him: "Behold now the behemoth which I made *to be* with thee;" and that the vision remained before him during the entire description.

Before dismissing the passage under consideration, viz: "which I made with thee;" I wish the reader to take particular notice, in this case, of the verb *to make*. Gesenius in his lexicon, says: "Often *asah* (עָשָׂה), is so put as to express the simple idea of a verb of action, *to do*, *to act*, rendered definite only by the context or the circumstances." The Vulgate translates this word by *facere*, and most translators render it by the verb *to make*, *to do*. Umbreit, however, takes the liberty of render-

ing it by the verb *to create*, and translates; "which I created as well as thee." To this translation I object on the grounds that, had it been one of the animals created by God at the beginning, the same word *bara* (בָּרָא) which is used in Gen. i. 1. would have been used in this instance also. The use of the expression *to make*, *to construct*, instead of *to create*, specially when the creating of an animal is concerned, is, to say the least, very remarkable, when one takes into consideration that it is the Creator Himself who makes use of the word. Therefore the strong presumption in my favor that this monster was not one of the created animals.

Had the Lord said "which I have created," it would have had a strong tendency to prove that this one had been created from the beginning, in the same way as animals, and that he was an animal. But it happens here, as you will notice it to often occur throughout this wonderful prophecy, that the very word which might be looked to as proving beyond a doubt that this monster was an animal, is wanting in strength; and that a word of very doubtful meaning is made use of, to the great embarrassment of those who suppose that some animal is here meant.

That the Lord, in this instance, should express Himself as though he had already made this creature at the time, has no further meaning than that He had already provided all the things necessary to its construction, and that, in its proper time, He would cause it to appear.

He had so designed it from the beginning, and then spoke of it as an accomplished fact with Him. Here I would quote Romans iv. 17: "God . . . who calleth those things which be not as though they were." "Qui . . . vocat ea quæ non sunt, tanquam ea quae sunt." So that this mode of expression with God was well understood long ago.

From this exposition the reader will readily see that this passage cannot be relied on to prove that the so-called *behemoth* was a *created animal*, nor that he was already in existence upon the earth at the time the Lord addressed Job.

Moreover I am confident that the elucidation of the whole will soon dissipate the doubts which may arise as to the reference of difficult and isolated passages.

The second hemistich of this verse seems to refer to the food of this extraordinary creature, and, in our ordinary English translations, reads as follows: "he eateth grass as an ox." A more literal rendering would be "he will eat." The verb *to eat* seems to have, in all languages, the same various meanings of *to eat*, *to consume*, *to devour;* and can be applied to animate as well as inanimate things. I prefer here the expression *to consume*.

But taking the word *chatzir* in its most common acceptation, we find it to mean primarily *an enclosure;* then *grass*, *herbage*. The same connection of ideas can be found under the Greek word χορτος, by which the Septuagint translate in this instance. The Vulgate renders the word by *fœnum*, *hay*,

straw. Most of our English commentaries translate *grass*. I would prefer here the word *fodder*, then *herbage*, as answering all the requirements of the case. So far I consider this part of the verse to mean "he will consume herbage or fodder, as well as the ox;" but here instead of the word *ox*, I would prefer the word *cattle*, and for these reasons.

The original word (בָּקָר) *bakar*, rendered *ox*, means in its primary sense *to cleave*, *to plough*, and is generally used collectively for *oxen*, *cattle;* as in Job i. 3, "five hundred yoke of oxen," which, says Barnes *in loco*, "would be quite as appropriately rendered *cattle*."

The same word is used in the same sense in v. 14. "The oxen were ploughing," which Barnes remarks should be rendered *cattle* as including not merely *oxen*, but probably also *cows*. The same reasons prevail here, for the comparison is evidently intended to be general; there is nothing in the fact of eating or consuming straw or food which is more peculiarly the attribute of the *ox*, than of *cattle* in general. Moreover there is nothing in the context which goes to show that the *ox* is particularly intended, but everything rather tends to show that the expression is general. Consequently I render this passage; He (or it) will consume herbage, or fodder as well as cattle do.

The above, as will be seen, has a much wider range of application than the bare assertion that "he eateth grass like an ox." Yet it is perfectly

consistent with the meaning of the original words. Now, why should it be related as a strange and remarkable thing, that this one *consumes* (or eateth) *grass*, or *straw*, etc., *as well as cattle do?* Have we not here an insight into the problem? We certainly cannot help inferring, from the wording of this passage, that this creature is of an entirely different nature from *cattle* in general; otherwise it could not be related as a strange thing that he should consume fodder as well as cattle do. Evidently, were he to be found among cattle, it would be quite absurd to say that he eats grass, fodder, etc., *as well as* cattle do. We can, therefore, safely infer from this that the *behemoth* is not to be found among any species of cattle.

It would also be well to take notice that it cannot be inferred from this passage that the behemoth consumed these things *in the same manner as* cattle, but simply that he did so *as well as* cattle; which leaves in my favor the possibility that he consumed straw, hay, fodder, in a *different manner* from cattle, although he did it *as well as* they.

Let us now see how the meaning of this passage would agree with the well-known habits of our modern creature of power, the steam engine.

It must be acknowledged as a singular coincidence that he also consumes *food*, such as wood, coal, peat; which constitutes his life-giving elements, as well as straw and fodder are those of cattle. Even the expression *to consume* is technical with our firemen, who can be daily heard to say—

My engine consumes so many tons of coal, so many cords of wood.

Then again, for the benefit of those who may wish to hold me to the very letter of the original, and wish me to account for the straw, or fodder, which is specially mentioned as an article he consumes, I would say that our modern engine of power does literally consume *straw*, *hay*, *peat* and the like, and that several valuable patents have been recently granted for an apparatus by means of which the furnace of a boiler is *fed* with *straw*, *hay*, or any kind of dried vegetable fodder, and such an apparatus is called *a feeder*. It is a well-known fact that even corn has been fed to our voracious monster. So that our modern behemoth does literally *consume straw*, and *hay*, and *corn*, as well as cattle do, and fulfills to the very letter the words of this prophecy.

It is supposed, by many, that the behemoth and leviathan were beasts well known to Job and to the inhabitants of the Jordan. In reference to this I would say, that there is neither history nor tradition to prove that such creatures were ever known to mankind; or that there ever existed in any part of the world, any beast or beasts which bore the name of *behemoth*, or *leviathan*. Surely, if such powerful and indestructible monsters existed in the times of Job, they would have survived long enough to have been at least recognized by the ancient Egyptians and carved on some of those imperishable monuments, the same as the hippopotamus, the crocodile and the elephant,

faithful representations of which have thus reached down to us. But in vain has the naturalist searched for them among the extinct mastodons and reptiles; and the commentator labored to prove, from the unyielding words of the original, their possible identity with the hippopotamus, or the alligator.

This description, or rather prophecy, as will be seen, is, throughout, highly poetical and allegorical. The various parts and capacities of the so-called *behemoth* and *leviathan*, are described under the simile of corresponding parts and capacities in animals.

For instance, as we have just seen, the consumption of straw and coal, are likened to the consumption of food by cattle. Further on we will see that the draft of air which enlivens the coals of fire in the furnace, is likened to the inhaling or breathing of an animal, which is a very poetic and proper comparison. In a similar way we will find described the various parts and capacities of these monsters.

As we proceed, many doubts, as to the proper meaning of difficult passages, will vanish, and many doubtful expressions will become intelligible and easily applied, when viewed as referring to our modern creatures of power.

Having thus explained the meaning and reference of a passage which has perplexed many, I would now offer the following rendering as its solution:

"Behold now one with *violent* ragings which I made *to be* with thee; he will consume fodder as well as cattle do."

THE POWER AND STRENGTH OF BEHEMOTH.

Verse 16

הִנֵּה־נָא	Behold also	Fortitudo
כֹחוֹ	his strength	ejus
בְמָתְנָיו	*is* in, depends on, his loins;	in lumbis ejus,
וְאוֹנוֹ	and his power, ability, *is*	et virtus illius
בְּשִׁרְיֵי	within the encircling parts	in umbilico
בִטְנוֹ׃	of his belly.	ventris ejus.

"Lo now, his strength *is* in his loins, and his force *is* in the navel of his belly."

In this verse, as you will notice, Job's attention is called particularly to the strength and power of the behemoth; yet, after a short reflection, one will perceive that it is not so much his extraordinary strength and power which he is called to notice, as their particular locality.

Undoubtedly there must have been something peculiar in this to be noticed, something different from other animals, otherwise there would have been no special necessity for calling attention to it.

The Septuagint, the Vulgate, and commentators generally, render "His strength *is* in his loins." The original must, evidently, be intended to mean that this monster's strength *de-*

pended on the strength of his loins, or flanks. I consider that it should be thus expressed, as all writers on this subject agree that the strength or thickness of these parts must be meant.

Some suppose that the thickness or impenetrability of the skin of the hippopotamus, is alluded to. This cannot be, for the skin of his loins is not any thicker than it is in any other part of his body; neither can it be said to be impenetrable.

All the parts of the behemoth seem to have been strong and firm even to an extraordinary degree. This is evident from what is said in verse eighteenth: "His *hollow* bones are tubes of brass; his *solid* bones are of iron as if hammered out." As I consider the behemoth to be the same as the leviathan,—as far at least as his main features are concerned—I would also refer to chapted xli. 15–17; "His excellence *depends on* courses of shields closed up tightly with a seal." These are the parts which I consider to be referred to here as constituting his strength, and as forming or protecting his loins.

Had this verse been written as explanatory of the one under consideration, it could not have been more complete and explicit; as it points out directly to that which constitutes the strength or excellence of the body of this monster, and, consequently, of his loins.

That the reader may obtain a clear insight into the nature of these loins and shields, I will also quote, according to the original Hebrew, the

second verse referred to above, "One will cleave fast to another; they will be caught together that they cannot be sundered."

These passages confirm and elucidate the previous one, and are a strong proof that that which constituted the strength of the loins or flanks of this monster must have been a covering made of courses of shields; that they were tightly sealed together; that they were firm and strongly united the one to the other. This being the case, then it is not the potential energy or power of the behemoth, as some suppose, which is alluded to here, but the material strength of those parts forming his loins or flanks. In fact most commentators have interpreted this passage as referring to the strength and toughness of the muscles of the belly, or to the impenetrability of the parts which covered his loins. This passage would suit our modern monster of power very well. Indeed his strength depends on the tensile strength or firmness of his loins or flanks. The stronger the boiler-plates—which really constitute both his loins and his flanks—the more pressure he can bear, consequently the more power he can exert.

This again depends on the strength of the various parts of the engine; the stronger they are the greater the strain which they can bear. In fact the strength of a steam boiler and engine is limited only by the strength of the material composing them. Surely this passage could not apply with more force and truth to any known

animal than our modern behemoth, for "behold indeed, his strength depends on the firmness of his loins."

The ordinary English rendering of the second part of this verse is; "And his force is in the navel of his belly."

What is meant by saying that the *force* of this creature is in the *navel* of his belly, is difficult to understand. To decide this it will be necessary to ascertain, first, what is meant by the original Hebrew word (אוֹן) *on*, rendered here *force*, and by some *energy*. Its meaning, according to the lexicons, is, *faculty of doing*, *ability*. It is quite different from the word (כֹּחַ) which occurs in the first part of the verse, and means strength, and shown to refer to the material strength of his loins, or flanks. From this difference of expressions must be inferred a difference also in the nature of the things alluded to. Consequently these two words should not be confounded here the one with the other.

The Septuagint render it by *dunamis*, which has a variety of meanings, such as *ability*, *force*, *virtue*, *energy*, etc. The Vulgate has *virtus*, *vigor*, *strength*. Barnes and Prof. Lee render it by *vigor*.

From the primary meaning of the word it would seem that *the faculty of doing* or *performing work* was here meant, but not his *vigor* or *energy*, as understood by Prof. Lee and others; nor the strength or firmness of any special part of his structure, as we will more clearly understand by what follows in the balance of this

verse, and by the gradual unfolding of this description.

The intrinsic value and bearing of the original words must be admitted to be of vast importance in the present case; and it is only in adhering closely to their true meaning that we may expect to discover their true reference.

Before explaining to what this mysterious *force* or *faculty of doing work* refers, it will be necessary, in order to realize its full bearing, to investigate also the meaning of the words which are immediately connected with it.

We find, in most versions, that this *force* is said to be "in the navel of his belly."

It is also the rendering of the Vulgate. Strange to say, it does not appear that the original word, as it occurs in this passage, has ever been used before in the sense of navel.

The Septuagint render it by (ομφαλος), *omphalos*, which, besides meaning *navel*, is also used to mean a *bosse*, and the *centre* of a round body.

Barnes, in his Notes, says: "It is not used to denote the *navel* in any place in the Bible, and should not have been so rendered here."

Prof. Lee translates it by firmness, and adds: "Bochart assumes here, after the Rabbins, that the word signifies *the navel*, which is altogether groundless; and then argues that the elephant cannot be meant, because the skin of his belly is soft, while that of the hippopotamus is hard and impenetrable. He ought to have seen that there is no ground for supposing that the word

signifies *navel;* and even if it had, that it is absurd to suppose that the strength of any animal consists in its navel; and, further, allowing even this to be true, that the hardness or softness of the skin, in any case, can have anything to do with the question. On my view, it will apply just as well to the horse, the ass, the wild horse and ass, to the elephant, etc., as it will to the hippopotamus. I take the technical term *viscera—bowels* with us—as exactly expressing the force of (בֶּטֶן) *beten*, in such passages as this, and the meaning to be, that his internal texture is so firm and powerful, that hence the great strength visible in the action of his loins is accounted for."

Contrary to these views I would say, that this passage evidently refers to some mysterious power or force located inside of this monster's flanks, and that there is no good reason for the supposition that it had anything to do with his bowels, or the strength of his internal structure.

To say, as Prof. Lee remarks, that the strength of any animal consists in its navel, is, indeed, absurd. But, possibly, it is not an animal which is here referred to, and that it is only on account of the similarity of some part of this monster's body to the navel that it is here so called. In such a case it might be the seat of some unsuspected power. But I cannot agree that the word here means the viscera, nor the possible firm and powerful texture of these; but rather some independent *ability of acting* which was located inside of this monster's flanks; or possibly within some

other part which, from its position and appearance, resembled the navel. It might apply here, with great propriety, to the steam dome of our boilers which, from its form and position in the centre of the boiler, and its long connecting brass tube—quite typical of the navel string—would fulfill all the requirements of the case, specially when we take notice that it does contain within it the actual *force*, or *faculty of doing work*, of this monster, viz., *dry steam*. It has still a more direct reference to the boiler itself and to the great *force* of steam which is within it, as I will more fully explain hereafter. The strength of the behemoth was spoken of in the first part of this verse, consequently it would be a useless and improbable repetition here. Therefore, I conclude that no reference can be had here to the strength or firm texture of any of his internal or external parts.

Barnes, commenting on this passage, says: "The reference is to the muscles and tendons of this part of the body (the belly), and perhaps particularly to the fact that the hippopotamus, by crawling so much on his belly among the stones of the stream or on land, acquires a peculiar hardness or strength in those parts of the body. This clearly proves that the elephant is not intended. In that animal, this is the most tender part of the body."

Really, this supposition, that the hippopotamus, by crawling on his belly, might perhaps acquire a peculiar hardness and strength in those parts

of the body, is a very gratuitous one. Even so, what remarkable power or strength could there be in such callous and unnatural formations, which, after all, would only cover a very insignificant portion of his body?

Let us see if the original words themselves could not lead us to a more satisfactory solution of this difficult problem.

In deciding the meaning of words occurring in very ancient manuscripts, it is essential to study well their primary meaning, as their application and meaning are apt to change with succeeding generations. For instance, the word (שָׁרִיר) *sharir*, which is here rendered *navel*, is derived from (שָׁרַר) *sharar*, meaning primarily *to twist*, *to twist together*, *to go in a circle*; kindred with roots (שור) *shour*, *to go round;* (טור) *tour*, *to surround;* (דור) *dour*, *a circle*. All of which contain the primary idea of *turning about*, *going in a circle*, in various modifications, hence *navel*. (Gesenius, lex.)

According to this, (שָׁרִיר) *sharir* ought to have here a meaning in keeping with the idea which the root of the word—as well as that of many kindred roots—conveys. As the word is here in the plural form, it should refer to parts *twisted together*, *bent in a circle*. Or, according to kindred roots, to parts that *went round*, *surrounded*, *encircled* this monster's belly. Therefore, in this instance, being justified by the context and the evident form of this monster's body, I look upon this word as referring to certain parts which *went*

around and completely *encircled* this monster's body as well as *his belly*, within which this mysterious *force*, or *faculty of performing work*, was located.

According to this, the entire verse would mean: "Behold, also, his strength *depends on* his loins; and his faculty of performing work is within the encircling parts of his belly." The question now arises, to what can be applied the meaning of these *encircling parts*, and of that mysterious *force* which is located within them?

I believe that this difficult point can be solved from the very words of this description. In the first place, it is evident, from the words of this and other passages already quoted, that these *encircling parts* formed some sort of a covering for this creature's body, and that this encircled him round about. Some writers believe that his thick hide is here meant. Others, his scales. If the reference be to some similar parts,—of which I have no doubt—then I am confident that we have a full description of them in the forty-first chapter, verses 13, 15, 16.

Further, this identity of parts between the so-called behemoth and leviathan will be strong evidence of the probability of what I have claimed from the beginning, viz., that these supposed different animals refer, in fact, to the one and the same power, but described under its different forms and capacities.

My application, therefore, to behemoth, of verses generally applied to the leviathan, will be understood.

According to the original Hebrew, the first verse referred to above reads: "Who can strip off the facings of his covering?" According to this it is evident that this monster was covered with some sort of a jacket, or armor, made of various parts or facings. This is rendered still more evident from the verse which follows: "His excellence *depends on* courses of shields closed up tightly with a seal."

Surely this sounds very much like some piece of manufactured work. Further, it goes to show that his excellence, or strength, depended on numerous shields, which seem to have completely covered his body, just as must be inferred from those *encircling parts* of the belly of the behemoth. But listen to what the sixteenth verse reveals to us in reference to the nature of these same shields, or encircling parts, of this monster's body. The Hebrew has: "They will drive (or join) one upon another." Can such expressions apply in the case of the crocodile or the hippopotamus? Are we not clearly justified in inferring from these expressions that these were iron shields; that they were driven and hammered together as are iron boiler-plates? We are even told, as seen above, that these courses of shields were "closed up tightly with a seal;" exactly what is done with every boiler that is made, viz.: calked.

Having thus gained an insight into the nature and form of these *encircling parts* of the behemoth, let us see what could have been the nature

of his other great capacity called (אונו) *ono*, *force*, *power*, *energy;* and described as being located *inside* of these encircling parts of his body.

That there must have been some strange force, or power, located also within the flanks of the leviathan, is evident from the second part of verse sixteenth, just quoted; where it is said of his shields, "They will drive (join) one upon another, that a hiss of air shall not escape *from* between them." And what does this indicate, if not that there was some great pressure of air, or vapor, or some force confined within him, and not allowed to escape? Taking these supposed two monsters as being identical, we have clearly revealed to us the nature of this mysterious force or faculty of performing work, which was, singularly enough, also located inside the strange encircling armor of the behemoth.

This same force, or power, is evidently indicated in the eighth verse, same chapter, which reads: "Place thy hand upon him; be mindful of the battling forces (rage), and thou wilt venture no further."

This is sufficient to prove, to the most incredulous, that there was some mighty raging force, or power, confined within the leviathan; and that, to all appearances, it was the same mysterious *force* represented as being within the encircling shields of the behemoth; a further evidence of the similarity of the body of these monsters, and of the identity of their nature.

There remains now the more difficult task of

finding out an animal, or rather a monster, which can be shown to possess such strange and extraordinary qualities and powers.

Assuredly, the hippopotamus, looked upon by most expositors of the present day as the one here alluded to, does not come up to these requirements. First, he has not *within his belly* that force or ability so distinctly and separately indicated here, nor anything like what would suit the context.

Secondly, there are no parts about him which might be called the *encircling parts* of his belly, unless it be his hide, and that is not in *parts*, but of one piece.

Thirdly, if the energy, or force, referred to here be the same as the pent-up air, or mighty rage not allowed to escape,—which seems quite evident—then there is nothing in the well-known internal forces and capacities of the hippoptamus, nor in those of any known animal, which resembles this in the least.

Let us now see if our modern monster of strength and power possesses any of these essential requisites.

His main feature is an elongated tubular-shaped boiler, which, poetically or figuratively speaking, can very appropriately be called his body, or belly; because, like an animal—unto which he is here likened—this part contains his vital power or energy, and to it are also made fast his various members. In like manner, his *rounded sides*, can very poetically be called his flanks.

This boiler is formed of numerous iron plates, or shields, firmly bolted and hammered the one to the other, and tightly sealed together. As these shields cover his body round about, they necessarily form also *the encircling parts of his belly.* Now, within these iron bound flanks, or, inside of these encircling parts, is generated an enormous *force*, or *capacity of doing work*, called the motive power of this monster, his potential energy.

If we now compare this pent-up force of our iron-shielded monster with that mysterious energy, or power of the behemoth, which is said to be "within the encircling parts of his belly," we cannot help being convinced of their identity, as well as of that of the other parts here mentioned.

This mysterious power which is within the behemoth is not, according to the original Hebrew, said to be his *strength*, but *a force*, *a capacity of performing work*, some potential energy. And this is exactly the case with our steam engine and boiler; it is its *motive power* which is within it; but its *strength* depends on the firmness of its flanks. Therefore our iron-bound monster not only fulfills the requirements of this singular and difficult verse, but it enables us to fully realize the wisdom of the selection of each of its words, and to appreciate the extraordinary beauty of the comparison.

To it, undoubtedly, can be applied these words of Job: "Behold also, his strength depends on his loins, and his power (ability) is within the encircling parts of his belly."

HIS TAIL IS LIKE A CEDAR.

Verse 17.

יַחְפֹּץ (יַחְפֹּ֥ץ)	It will set upright	Stringit
זְנָבוֹ	his tail	caudam suam
כְּמוֹ־אָרֶז	like a cedar;	quasi cedrum:
גִּידֵי	the ligaments, couplings of	nervi testicu-
פַחְדּוֹ	his leaping parts, thighs	lorum ejus
יְשֹׂרָגוּ׃	will be clamped together.	perplexi sunt.

"He moveth his tail like a cedar; the sinews of his thighs are wrapped together."

It has been found very difficult to apply, in their primary sense, the words of this verse to any known animal; and, consequently, the original has suffered much at the hands of exegetists.

The tail of the behemoth, specially, has caused a great deal of speculation. There must have been something very remarkable about it, since it is made the subject of a particular description, and especially when it is compared to a cedar. The difficulties of finding an animal with such a remarkable appendage have excited the suspicions of many, and given rise to various renderings and comments.

The Vulgate endeavored to avoid the difficulty

by rendering: "Stringit caudam suam quasi cedrum,"—"he twisteth up his tail like a cedar." Prof. Lee renders: "He maketh his tail to bend like *the* cedar." Barnes has: "He bendeth his tail like the cedar." I cannot see how the original could have been intended in any such sense as the above. For, virtually, it would make it appear as though it said, "he bendeth his tail the same as the cedar-tree does." Then again, what is there in the twisting or bending of any animal's tail that would render it like a mighty cedar, unless it actually had some of its characteristics? And this is not made to appear in the above renderings.

The peculiarity of the cedar is, that it is straight, tall, and durable; it has a large trunk and yields but little to the strongest winds. It is not particularly known for moving or bending any more than ordinary trees. In all comparisons of things to a cedar-tree, it is generally on account of their possessing some of the above qualities. I am not aware that an object, easily twisted or bent, has been compared to a cedar. But the expressions, *as tall as a cedar*, *as strong* and *as durable as a cedar*, are often met with. Moreover the tail of an animal is horizontal or drooping, is generally small in proportion to the animal; it is very flexible, and generally short. Unless this monster's tail possessed some of the prominent features of the cedar-tree, there could exist no proper comparison. A tail, one or two feet long, could not, with propriety, be said to be

twisted or *moved* like a cedar. Yet this is precisely the case with those who would have us accept the hippopotamus or elephant as the one here alluded to.

Rosenmüller supposes the meaning to be that the tail of the hippopotamus is *smooth*, *round*, *thick* and *firm*. But all this is simply inferred, for there is nothing in the original to warrant it.

Bochart, who contends that the hippopotamus is the animal intended, labors hard to make this passage apply to it. He interpets (יַחֲפֹץ) *yachephots*, by *retorquet*, *flectit:* he *twisteth*, *bendeth;* and after describing the tail of the hippopotamus as short, thin and like that of a pig, says that this monster can bend and twist it at pleasure; and adds that this may be looked upon as a proof of his great strength.

Had he made out this tail to be as large and as strong as a cedar-tree, one might acknowledge the propriety of supposing that the wielding with ease of such an enormous appendage was proof of great strength, and that this might, indeed, be intended to illustrate his size and power. But, unfortunately, the tail of the hippopotamus being but a foot long, and very slim, the bending or twisting of it, ever so vigorously, could be no proof of the animal's great strength.

Then again it does not appear certain that the comparison here to a tall cedar, is intended to prove the great strength of the behemoth so much, perhaps, as some singular appearance or position of this monster's tail.

Barnes, alluding to the tail of the hippopotamus, says: "The point of comparison is not the *length*, but the fact of its being easily bent over or curved at the pleasure of the animal. Why this, however, should have been mentioned as remarkable, or how the power of the animal in this respect differs from others, is not very apparent. Some who have supposed the elephant to be referred to, have understood this of the proboscis. But though *this would be* a remarkable proof of the power of the animal, the language of the original will not admit of it. The Hebrew word (זָנָב) *zanav*, is used only to denote the tail. It is possible that there may be here an allusion to the unwielding nature of every part of the animal, and especially to the thickness and inflexibility of the skin; and what was remarkable was, that notwithstanding this, this member was entirely at its command. Still, the reason of the comparison is not very clear. The description of the movement of the *tail* here given would agree much better with some of the extinct orders of animals whose remains have been recently discovered and arranged by Cuvier, than with that of the hippopotamus. Particularly, it would agree with the account of the ichthyosaurus, ... though the other parts of the animal here described would not accord with this."

Such are this author's views with reference to the unsuitable application of this passage to the hippopotamus, or the elephant. In the above he

would seem to favor the idea that the *flexibility* of the tail of the behemoth was referred to; yet, whilst alluding to this animal (Vol. II. p. 269), he says: "He is distinguished for some peculiar movement of his tail—some slow and stately motion, or a certain *inflexibility* of the tail, like a cedar."

The latter shows that Barnes, though he found it difficult to make the application, believed also that the comparison here to a cedar might perhaps be intended to illustrate the *inflexibility* of this tail; and that it was in this peculiarity that it resembled a cedar.

Adam Clarke, commenting on the comparison of this tail to a cedar, says: "Therefore, it was neither the elephant, who has a *tail* like that of a hog, nor the hippopotamus, whose tail is only about a *foot* long."

Whatever view may be taken of the meaning of the first word of this verse, rendered, *he moveth*, *twisteth*, *bendeth;* one thing is evident, that this creature's tail is, in some respects, *like* a cedar-tree. Consequently any tail which is not, in any respect, *like a cedar-tree*, cannot be the one here alluded to.

It is also evident, that any *twisting* or *bending* of a short and thin tail—like that of the hippopotamus, or elephant—cannot make the same appear *like a cedar;* therefore it cannot entitle its possessor to the name of *behemoth*, whose tail is said to be *like a cedar.*

The next conclusion to be drawn from the

above facts is, that the expression *he moveth*, *twisteth*, or *bendeth*, cannot be the proper one here, since such motions have not the power of rendering a *tail* like *a cedar*, specially when the tail supposed to be referred to has none of its well-known characteristics. Moreover, the only possible meaning which the Latin and English translations could have, under the circumstances, is that this creature bends and twists his tail as the cedar does, or the same as he bends and twists a cedar; and, certainly, no one will admit that he considers this to be the meaning intended here.

The solution of this difficult problem depends, undoubtedly, on the proper interpretation of the word (חָפֵץ) *chaphets*. After pondering much over this word, I have come to the conclusion that it is quite possible that, at one time, it read (חָפַז) *chaphaz*, which, phonetically, differs but little from the above, and means *to rise up*, or, *to start up* suddenly. Here it would mean that this tail will rise up suddenly, without branching off, or that it will be made to *rise up* or *set upright* like a tall tree.

I would here refer to the Septuagint who seem to have taken the word in the same sense. They render this passage thus: "He setteth up his tail like a cypress."

That this is the proper meaning of the original Hebrew word is confirmed also by Castell, who renders it by *firmabit*, *stabiliet*, *eriget;* he will firmly set, erect. A marginal reading, quoted by

several authors, has "*setteth up*," as explanatory of the meaning of the word. As I have shown, this is the only meaning which can agree with the context.

It will be noticed, furthermore, that it cannot be argued that the original makes the act of *setting up* this tail as absolutely dependent on behemoth, as most all versions make it appear. On the contrary, I consider the proper reading to be: "His tail will set upright like a cedar." By this rendering the comparison of this appendage to a cedar becomes natural, and at the same time leaves us to infer that it was tall, strong and large. Had it been short, or thin and long, it would have been more natural to have compared it to a flexible twig. All this leads us to infer that this strange appendage of the so-called behemoth resembled a cedar, not from its capacity to bend and twist, but from its being large, and standing erect, upright. Mr. Good is quoted as saying that this monster must have possessed "*a rigid* and *enormous* tail, like a cedar."

These points being settled, both from the context and the interpretation of standard authors, there now remains the still more difficult task of finding to what sort of a monster such a description could apply.

It is evident that neither the elephant nor the hippopotamus can have any claims to this description; and as, after centuries of researches, none more suitable have been found, it would seem useless to search any further among animals

to find one endowed with such extraordinary attributes.

Let us now take a glance at our modern monster, as he stands complete and ready for work, and see if we cannot discover something about him which might, with propriety, be called—in the highly figurative language of this description —*a tail.*

According to all the requirements, it should be tall and strong, and set upright, and be proportionate to the object with which it is compared, viz., a cedar. Without these requirements, I contend that it cannot be the one referred to.

From the general opinion of writers on this subject, this appendage of the behemoth seems to have been specially mentioned on account of its possessing some strange peculiarity. The reader, therefore, should not be astonished if he should discover, for the first time, that our modern monster of power possesses, indeed, an exceptionally strange tail, which *setteth upright like a cedar.*

I have reference to the smokestack of our large stationary engines.

As you will readily admit, the boiler is really the main part, or rather *body*, of our monster; as it is not only the largest part of it, but, moreover, contains its vital power.

The *head* of this body is that end at which is located the furnace, and the other extremity is called the *tail end*, and from this runs up the smokestack. Therefore, it is also at the *tail end*

of the *body* of our monster that stands his enormous caudal appendage. From the position of the latter arises the propriety of comparing it to the *tail* of an animal; which comparison, none will deny, is very natural and highly poetical. This being understood, the reader will have no further trouble in comprehending the propriety of the figurative and poetical language of the original description, and its surprising application to the caudal appendage of our iron monster. It *setteth upright like a cedar*, according to the very words of the original. It is *tall*, rising up from twenty to seventy-five feet, or more, according to circumstances. It is *strong*, being made of heavy sheets of iron. It is *large*, varying with the requirements of the boiler and engine, and measures from two to twenty feet in circumference. And, finally, it is *inflexible*, being made of iron. It is thus, in every respect, proportionate to the cedar, to which the tail of the behemoth is compared.

I would now ask, which of the two resembles the most the object to which it is compared? Is it the tail of the hippopotamus, which, as you have seen, is insignificant, entirely out of proportion, unworthy of notice in such a sublime description? Or the lofty appendage of our steaming monster, which is majestic and ornamental, and not only worthy of notice in such a description as this, but really essential to its completeness? I do not fear that the verdict will be adverse to our champion, as he seems to be the first and only

one who has furnished us a plausible solution of the singular difficulties of this passage.

It might be interesting to notice here that the very word *stack* (smokestack) signifies that which *is set*, or made to *stand up*, corresponding exactly with the meaning of the original Hebrew word made use of here, viz., *to set up;* which, to say the least, is a very singular coincidence.

This reference, to a tall smokestack, would indicate that the stationary engine and boiler are here meant, as the locomotive has, comparatively, a small stack.

Another singular fact worthy of special notice, and the very one which led me, after many researches, to identify this mysterious appendage as the one referred to here, was the ornamental trimmings which often crown the top of these smokestacks. They resemble large palm leaves, and really, at a distance, lend to the whole the appearance of a tall palm tree. I should not be surprised if the comparison of Job applied to a palm tree instead of a cedar. In reference to this, it would seem as if some doubts already existed in the days of the Septuagint, for, instead of *cedar*, they render *cypress*.

The palm tree has a straight, unbranching, cylindric stem, terminating in a crown of leaves. The great palm, a native of Asia and Africa, attains to great height. It was undoubtedly well known to Job, and would serve admirably well as a comparison here.

As, of old, the palm leaves were a token of

victory and triumph, I will accept them in the same sense, in this instance, for the victory and triumph of my iron-clad monster over all other competitors. He deserves, indeed, to be ornamented with them.

THE LIGAMENTS OF THE THIGHS OF THE BEHEMOTH.

It would be rather a hard task for me to prove that the behemoth and leviathan referred to our steam motor, if I were bound to accept, as inspired, some of our versions of this description. The rendering, for instance, of the second hemistich of the verse under consideration, would be sufficient to deter me from further attempt; but, fortunately, the original is at hand.

The Vulgate, and after it various translators have rendered this passage: "Nervi testiculorum ejus perplexi sunt." I cannot understand why the primary meaning of the original words should have been thus ignored. There certainly exists no good reason for the above rendering. Some have translated: "The sinews of his thighs are knit together." This is by far preferable to the ordinary English version. Yet I do not consider it to be the meaning intended here. In the first place, it does not seem probable that the sinews of his thighs would be *knit together*, or *wrapped together*, any more than the sinews of any other part of his body. Even so, there would be nothing very extraordinary about this. In the second place, we have just been told, in the previous verse, that his *strength* was in his

loins, and *his force* within the encircling parts of his belly. This would have been the place to have spoken about *his sinews*, if some peculiarity of these had been intended as a proof of his strength.

From the wording of this passage it seems evident to me that it is the peculiar *coupling* of his *joints* which is alluded to, and not the manner in which his *sinews* are knit or wrapped together.

The Septuagint render it: "His sinews are interwoven." By this rendering they leave out the important word *thigh*, which is a serious omission.

Barnes supposes that the object of the description is to inspire a sense of the *power* of the animal, or of his capacity to inspire terror or dread; and hence that the allusion here is to those parts which were fitted to convey this dread, or this sense of his power—to wit, his strength. He therefore renders: "The sinews of his *terror* are wrapped together." He then explains that by *terror* is meant *those parts fitted to inspire terror*, viz., his *thighs* or *haunches*, as being formidable in their aspect, and the seat of strength.

I must confess that I cannot see the propriety of introducing here the word *terror*. The idea intended to be conveyed by the original is more likely to have been that of strength; then, possibly, that of certain remarkable peculiarity in the manner in which the various parts of his limbs were united together.

Most of the trouble in this passage has originated with the misinterpretation of the word (גִּיד) *gid*, rendered *sinews*. It signifies, according to the root of the word, *to bind*, *to tie together*, *to couple;* hence, *a nerve*, *a sinew*, *a tendon*.

As the word occurs in the form of a noun in the plural, it would mean, in the primary sense of the word, *parts* serving *to bind*, *ties*, *couplings*, *joints*. The reference here, then, would be to those parts which serve as a means of uniting, or coupling together, two movable parts, whether these be bones, wood or metal. In anatomy they are called *ligaments;* in mechanics, *couplings;* in cabinet work, *tenons*. The proper word here would be ligaments, or couplings.

The word (פָּחַד) *pachad* rendered *thigh*, has as its primary meaning that of *leaping*, *springing;* then *thigh;* then *trepidation*. When the word occurs in the plural or dual form, says Gesenius, it means *the thighs*.

I take the primary meaning of this word, viz., that of leaping, or that of moving up and down, as indicating the exact parts referred to here, but figuratively called his thighs. For, from what we have already seen of the nature of this monster, we cannot suppose this word is intended to be taken literally, but rather figuratively for some parts which are to it what the thighs are to an animal, that is, its means of propulsion.

In the steam engine you will recognize these

to be the movable connecting rods and pitmans. They are united the one to the other by means of various couplings, straps and bolts, or rather *keys*. These connecting rods are strong and heavy, and made of solid iron. Their movements are fourfold; forward, up, down, and backward, and resemble the motions of a boy's lower limbs when propelling a velocipede, or like those of the arm of a person turning a crank.

When propelling a fly-wheel, or the large driving-wheels of a locomotive, they really appear to be constantly *leaping* forward. The very motion of these parts, therefore, corresponds exactly with the primary meaning of the Hebrew word by which they are designated. These massive bars of iron are to the steam engine what the thighs are to an animal, viz., a means of propulsion. The steam from the boiler, entering the steam chest and cylinder, forces to and fro the piston and piston-rod to which is connected the pitman, and to this the connecting rod, which latter is made fast to a crank on the large driving-wheels of a locomotive; or, in stationary engines, to an eccentric on the shaft of a fly-wheel, and by these means exerts its power, either in propelling itself or in setting in motion ponderous machinery. Poetically or figuratively speaking, these parts may, therefore, be well called the *limbs* or *thighs* of the steam engine, as they are not only its movable parts but also its means of propulsion.

What is meant by the word rendered *sinews*

can now be well understood to refer to those parts which seem to unite together these massive connecting rods and pitmans, yet allowing each part its proper motion, the same as the *ligaments* do to which these are compared. The manner in which these massive bars are connected is clearly indicated by the word (שָׁרַג) *sharag*, meaning to *interweave*, *to connect together*.

The Arabic is still better, as it means *to clap* together; which is equal to our English expression *to clamp together*, *to couple together*.

Therefore I render, "the ligaments (or couplings) of his thighs will be clamped together."

The difficulties of this verse have been recognized by all; but I hope to have succeeded in demonstrating its true meaning and reference.

HIS BONES ARE TUBES OF METAL AND BARS OF IRON.

Verse 18.

עַצְמָיו	His bones *are*	Ossa ejus
אֲפִיקֵי	tubes, channels	velut fistulæ
נְחוּשָׁה	of copper, brass;	æris;
גְּרָמָיו	his solid bones *are*	cartilago illius
כְּמֹטִיל	as hammered out bars	quasi laminæ
בַּרְזֶל׃	of iron.	ferreæ.

"His bones *are as* strong pieces of brass; his bones *are* like bars of iron."

Even the casual reader will notice that there must be something wrong in the above English rendering of this verse. Evidently all the bones of this monster could not have been *like pieces of brass* and at the same time *like bars of iron;* for there is too much difference in the appearance and tensile strength of these metals. It would seem more probable that the original referred to different kinds of bones, and that these varied in appearance and quality. In fact, upon investigation, we find that the original, as well as the Vulgate and French versions, make quite a distinction between these bones.

Another very important fact to which I would call the reader's attention, is, that in nearly all

translations these bones are made to appear as though they were simply *compared to* strong pieces of brass, and to bars of iron, whilst in the original Hebrew there is absolutely no expression which indicates any such comparison. Neither can I admit that the words are necessarily understood. As the case now stands, the addition or omission of such an expression is of vast importance; for there is a great difference between having bones of solid iron, and bones *like* iron, or *like* brass. The Hebrew has, literally, "His bones, tubes of brass; his *solid* bones, as hammered out bars of iron." The prefix preposition (כ) *caph* is not before the word *iron*, but before *hammered out*. With the proper construction this second hemistich would read, "his *solid* bones *are* bars of iron as if hammered out."

The Hebrew word (עֶצֶם) *atzam*, rendered *bones* has, as primary meaning, that of *to bind fast, to tie up;* then *a bone*, so called from its hardness and strength. The original word has also the meaning of *to be numerous*, which has a singular application here, as will be seen hereafter. The Septuagint render by "αι πλευραι αυτου," his ribs. The Vulgate, "ossa ejus," his bones. It would seem, from the derivation of the word, that the parts or bones here referred to, were so-called on account of being *bound*, or *made fast;* or on account of their great number. Both meanings of the word would apply well to our iron monster.

The word (אַפִּיקֵי) *aphikay*, rendered *strong pieces*, means, according to the root of the word, *to hold*,

to contain; then *a pipe*, *a tube*, *a channel*, from the idea of *holding*, *containing;* hence *strong*, *firm*. Undoubtedly *pipes*, or *tubes* are here alluded to; tubes of brass. The Septuagint pass over the word *tube*, but repeat the former, "πλευραι χαλκειαι"—ribs of brass. Prof. Lee gives the literal meaning as being "channels of copper," and remarks, "This is applied apparently to the hollow bones of the thighs, etc., which contain the marrow."

Barnes, on this passage, says: "The circumstance here adverted to was remarkable because the common residence of the animal was the water, and the bones of aquatic animals are generally hollow, and much less firm than those of land animals. It should be observed here, that the word rendered *brass* in the Scriptures most probably denotes *copper*. Brass is a compound metal, composed of copper and zinc; and there is no reason to suppose that the art of compounding it was known at as early a period of the world as the time of Job." This may be, but Barnes forgets that it is the Lord who is here speaking.

Then again I do not admit that *all* the bones of this monster are said to be solid. Neither are *all* those of the hippopotamus; nor those of any other animal which has been proposed as the one alluded to here.

A French translation has: "Ses os sont des barres d'airain." Umbreit renders: "His bones are tubes of brass." In these renderings you will notice that these bones are not *compared* to

brass, or copper, but they are *properly* said to be *of brass*, and not *like* brass. The Septuagint have taken the same view of the meaning of the original. Thus I am not the only one who has considered this the proper meaning of the Hebrew.

Then again, Gesenius, Rosenmüller and Noyes also render *tubes*, instead of *strong pieces* of brass. Schultens has *alvei*, channels.

It appears then evident from the original, and from the opinion and rendering of these learned authors, that the so-called *bones*, referred to in the first part of this verse, were *tubular*, and not *solid*. Therefore it would be proper to render "His *hollow* bones are tubes of brass." This would establish the required distinction between the two sets of bones mentioned in this verse; and give us, at the same time, a far better reading.

Such being the meaning of the original Hebrew, the question might be asked—If these *parts* be really and substantially *tubes of brass*, why are they called *bones?* The answer is plain, and has already been suggested, viz.: that, throughout this highly poetical description, the various parts and attributes of this so-called *behemoth* are likened to corresponding parts in various animals.

Hoping to have settled the meaning that we should attach to the important words of this verse, and to have succeeded in doing so as much from the direct affirmative character of the expressions themselves, as from the authorities quoted, who could not have been biased in favor of my views; I would question whether the original words

could be, at all, applied to any known animal, living or extinct. Even allowing the ordinary English rendering, and others, could the hollow bones of the hippopotamus, or of the elephant, be properly compared to *pieces of brass*, or *tubes of brass*. If these bones were said to be like strong tubes of *iron*, there might be some plausibility for supposing that the comparison was intended to prove the great strength of these bones; for the expression *like iron* is often made use of to denote great strength. But to liken to tubes of copper or brass the bones of a monster which is represented as the most extraordinary and most powerful on earth, is not saying much for his strength; nor does it come up to the idea one would have of the bones of such an animal. Brass is not comparatively strong; neither is it ever used as typical of great strength. It is even said in this very description that *brass* is to him as rotten wood (xli. 27). Therefore to compare the bones of a powerful monster to *tubes of brass* would not be saying much in his favor.

Moreover, has it been conclusively shown, by the advocates of the hippoptamus, or of the elephant, that these animals have indeed bones, which, for strength, color, or other peculiarities, resemble tubes of brass? Not only has it not been conclusively or even plausibly shown, but all of them touch very lightly on this verse, taking it for granted that it is intended to denote the strength of the bones of this animal.

But when one examines minutely into the

general flow of this description, he perceives that such a comparison would be out of place. And, finally, when he resorts to the original for a solution of these strange comparisons, he discovers that there exists, in fact, no such a comparison, but rather the no less perplexing statement that these *bones* are really and substantially *tubes of brass*. As there occur no prefix of comparison before any of the words of this hemistich, I have a full right to claim that it was not intended, and should not be substituted, especially if I can show that it has a very plausible meaning and reference without it.

Let us now take a glance at our steam engine and boiler, and see if there are any parts about it which are *tubes of brass*, or *of copper;* and which might, in the language of this description, be likened to his *hollow bones.*

Those who are well acquainted with the construction of the steam boiler, are well aware that there are connected with it a number of copper and brass pipes which serve to convey steam, water and even flames to and from its various parts. Some of these pipes are quite large and long; others are small tubes. But the most remarkable and numerous of these pipes occur inside of the boiler itself, and are called *flues.* They vary in number according to the size or requirements of the boiler; some having as many as two hundred. They extend the entire length of the boiler, and are made fast to the heads at each end of it.

These boilers are called *tubular boilers*. These tubes serve, not only as a means of conducting the heat of the furnace through the mass of water to be vaporized, but also to strengthen the heads at each end of the boiler.

In many upright boilers these tubes, instead of extending longitudinally through the boiler, are coiled inside; and a sectional view of them, thus coiled, resembles very much ribs of brass.

If we now compare the tubes and pipes of brass and of copper of our modern creature of power, with the *hollow bones* of the behemoth, we will recognize that they are, in every respect, what the original words of this description call for, viz., *tubes of copper*, or *of brass*. They are not merely *like* tubes, but *real* tubes. Not merely *like* copper or brass, but substantially made of either. They can, very poetically, be said to be the hollow bones of this monster; for like the bones of an animal they constitute an essential part of his body, and serve to strengthen it; being in fact a part of his frame work.

In certain types of upright boilers, as I have just referred to, these tubes of copper, being coiled within the boiler may, very appropriately, be likened to the *ribs* of his body, thus even agreeing with the rendering of the Septuagint, who translate, "His ribs are ribs of brass."

We have seen that the original word made use of to designate these hollow bones, has also, as its primary meaning, that of *to bind fast;* then also that of *to be numerous, many*. With

our modern monster we can see the singular application of these two definitions. For these tubes, or flues, besides being generally very *numerous* in certain types of boilers, are *made fast* to each head of the boiler, and serve, in great measure, *to bind* and strengthen them.

So well do the words of the original suit our modern behemoth, that of it only does it seem possible to say, "His hollow bones are tubes of brass."

In most translations the second part of this verse is rendered: "His bones are like bars of iron." In the original these *bones* are designated by a word different from the first, and were it not for the explanation which follows there would be no ready means of ascertaining whether it was intended for hollow or solid bones. Schultens renders, *his solid bones*. This the context seems to require, says Prof. Lee, "hence the comparison . . . as a bar of iron." The Vulgate renders, "cartilago illius," *his gristle*. But this does not express the plurality of parts indicated by the original word.

The Septuagint differ somewhat; they have *rachis* (ραχις), which means *the spine*, or *back bone*. But it is evident that the original word could not have been intended to refer to this, as the word occurs in the plural form. Then the spine of animals is not *solid*, as it must be inferred that these bones were, from the fact that they are said to be bars of iron as if hammered out.

The most important, as well as the most singu-

lar word in this passage, is, (מטיל) *metil*, *a hammered bar;* from the root (מָטַל) *matal*, meaning *to draw out*, *to make long;* hence *to forge*, *to hammer*. Adding to this the meaning of the prefix prepositions (כְּ) *caph*, which is, *as*, *as if*, *like;* we have, *as if hammered out bars*. Thus the entire passage should read: "His *solid* bones *are* bars of iron as if hammered out." I consider it of importance to notice here, that the preposition *as*, *as if*, does not occur before the word *iron*, but is prefixed to the previous word, thus, *as hammered out;* so that the particle of comparison does not apply directly to the word *iron*, as though it were said, his bones are *as* iron, or *like* iron. Therefore I consider that the proper rendering here is: "His *solid* bones *are* bars of iron as if hammered out." Taking this view of it, it becomes evident that the original asserts that these so-called *bones* were indeed *solid bars of iron*, and that this iron appeared *as if hammered out*.

Moreover this interpretation is required in order to establish a proper correspondence between the quality of these bones and that of his hollow ones, which, as we have seen, are distinctly said to be *of brass*.

The Septuagint must have had the same view of the meaning of the original, since they do not express any comparison; simply asserting that these parts were *of iron hammered out*, or *cast*.

Rosenmüller quoting the Arabic, gives here, *de ferro; cusum et in longum extensum*.

Here then occurs the extraordinary statement that the solid bones of the behemoth were bars of iron; and that these had the appearance of having been *forged*, *hammered out.* The importance of this passage becomes now more evident than ever, since we have now in our midst a monster full of vigor and of enormous power, whose hollow bones are tubes of brass, and his solid bones bars of iron hammered out.

As to the bones of the hippopotamus being alluded to here, I would say that no substantial claim has, or can be put forth that they are in any way differently constructed or composed, or in any way stronger than those of other animals of his size. Neither does it appear that there is any thing sufficiently extraordinary about the bones of the elephant to warrant their comparison to solid bars of iron hammered out.

Therefore, why should their bones, more than those of other animals, be compared to hollow or solid metal? Moreover, are there in the hippopotamus bones so extraordinary for their solidity and length, that they could be compared with propriety to solid bars of iron elongated, hammered out? And are there others so hollow and thin that they can be compared to tubes of brass, which are generally very thin in proportion to their size?

The advocates of the hippopotamus are silent on these important points. I would therefore conclude that, as this extraordinary verse calls for something peculiar and wonderful, something far

beyond what is common to animals, that neither the hippopotamus nor the elephant can lay any substantial claims to it.

If we now look to our iron monster for a solution, it will not be difficult to find, among the numerous bars of iron of all sizes which are connected with the engine and boiler, such as will fulfill the requirements of this passage.

Among its numerous solid bars of iron are, first, the exterior ones, which form part of the engine, such as the strong and ponderous connecting-rods and pitmans. They are made of solid bars of iron, carefully forged and hammered out. In large stationary engines they are of enormous size and weight; a single one of them would outweigh the largest known hippopotamus. Then there are numerous iron rods and bars of all sizes which form parts of the engine or of its frame work. In a locomotive most of these parts are double, besides a number of others not necessary in an ordinary stationary engine.

Secondly, the interior ones, which are the massive cast iron bars which form the fire grate, and are located inside the fire-box.

Either of these two sets of solid iron bars answers the description. So that our modern behemoth is not wanting in *solid bones of iron as if hammered out or cast.*

But it seems to me that this description is such a perfect one, that these solid bones, or bars of iron, cannot refer promiscuously to either

or all of these bars and rods, and that some special ones are here intended.

As these are likened to the bones of this monster, and that the bones of animals, with the exception of their horns, or tusks, are located within the different parts of their body; therefore in order that the comparison of these bars of iron to bones, be complete and proper, it seems to me necessary that they should be looked for among the inner parts of the body of our competitor; the same as we have seen that *his hollow bones* were located inside of his body. I therefore consider that the large cast-iron bars which form the grate of the fire-box, may be those specially referred to here, as they are virtually inside of a part of the body of our great monster.

If at this moment the inner construction of the boiler was being shown to Job, then the numerous tubes running through the entire length of the boiler, and the large solid cast-iron grate-bars, would be the first strange objects which would excite his admiration; therefore the description, in this verse, in the order in which it occurs.

How grand and poetic this verse appears, when we look upon its words as applying to our wonderful steam motor. Indeed "His *hollow* bones are tubes of brass; his *solid* bones are bars of iron as if hammered out."

Surely, those who hold to a literal interpretation and to the reference of this description to an animal (not yet known), will have some trouble to get over the weighty assertions of this verse.

IT IS THE GREATEST OF THE METHODS OF POWER.

Verse 19.

הִוא	He, or it, *is*	Ipse est
רֵאשִׁית	chief, greatest	principium
דַּרְכֵי־	of the ways, methods	viarum
אֵל	of power, might;	Dei,
הָעֹשׂוֹ	the one making him	qui fecit eum
יִגַּשׁ	will apply *unto him*	applicabit
חַרְבּוֹ	his sword.	gladium ejus.

"He *is* the chief of the ways of God: he that made him can make his sword to approach unto him."

THIS verse is one of the most difficult to render, and, as it now stands in our various translations, is one of the hardest to understand. Yet I hope to succeed in throwing some light upon its meaning and reference. I expect that it will be recognized to be one of the most extraordinary of this great prophecy. As a general rule, those verses which have perplexed expositors the most, have furnished me with the strongest evidence in support of my views. This one, I surmise, will not be an exception. As the subject of this description was a hard one to ascertain, there naturally arose a great deal of doubt as to the

proper rendering of the comprehensive expressions of the original. Morever, translators, doubtful of the real meaning and reference of difficult passages, often render them by non-committal expressions, which can never serve to solve a difficulty.

It is hard to understand what can be meant here by saying that this supposed beast *is the chief of the ways of God;* and that *he that made him can make his sword to approach unto him.* Can it be supposed that God, who is here represented as speaking to Job, would say, "He is the chief of the ways of God," instead of, "He is the chief of my ways?" Or, that He would speak of His own work as though it were that of some one else? For, such is the inference which can be drawn from the passage, "he that made him can make his sword to approach unto him;" or rather, more literally, "the one making him will apply his sword unto him."

Were it a created animal that was being alluded to, this mode of expression would appear, to say the least, very singular. But if we look upon this description as referring to some powerful mechanical device, the product of man's ingenuity, we perceive at once the reason of this, otherwise singular, passage.

After a close investigation, I find that the first part of this verse is susceptible of two different interpretations. First, "He is chief of the ways of God;" Second, "He is chief of the methods of power." The only means there is of deciding

as to the proper one, is the requirements of the context. The difficulty arises from the various meanings of the word (אֵל) *el.* Its primary meaning is, *strong*, *mighty*, *a mighty one;* then, *strength*, *might*, *power;* hence, *God*, *The Almighty*, *The Mighty one.* In Gen. xxxi. 29, we find (יֶשׁ לְאֵל יָדִי) *yesh lel yadi*, *i. e.*, it is in the *power* of my hand. Ez. xxxi. ii. (אֵל גּוֹיִם) *el goim*, *the mighty one among the nations.* Is. ix. 5, (אֵל גִּבּוֹר) *el gibbor*, *the mighty* hero. Concerning the meaning of this word, Gesenius remarks: "Following the example of most etymologists, we have above referred (אֵל) *el*, to the root (אוּל) *oul*, but to speak more accurately (אֵל) *el*, would seem rather to be a primitive word, yet adapted in a certain measure to an etymology from (אוּל) *oul;* so that to the mind of the Hebrew it always presented *the idea of strength and power.*"

From this you will perceive that the word may refer as well to *strength*, *might*, *power*, as to *God.* In prose, when spoken of God pre-eminently, it never stands alone, but always either with an attribute or another name of God. In the present instance, were the two words (דַּרְכֵי־אֵל) *darekay-el*, separated from the balance of the phrase, it would be very hard to decide whether it meant *the ways of God*, or, *the ways of power.*

But as it stands we have an entire passage to guide us in its meaning, and moreover a complete description of the one of whom it is supposed to be said, "He is *the chief* of the ways of God." Therefore, it will be easier to ascertain

the more probable and proper meaning of the two. Taking the statement as it stands, "He is *the chief* of the ways of God," it seems abrupt, isolated, not at all in keeping with what follows in the same verse. Then, if we reflect on the true import of these words, it assumes such proportions that one begins to doubt whether such language can be properly applied to any earthly creature.

If we now examine carefully into the nature of this creature we find it equally doubtful whether it should, or not, be classed among animals. Neither do we find it anywhere asserted that it was a *created* being. Even supposing that it was an extraordinary animal, or even the most astonishing piece of mechanism capable of being produced on earth, could it be said of either that it was *the chief*, or *the greatest*, of the ways of God? Were it an angel or even a man, we might concede the propriety of such expressions, since the latter could at least be looked upon as the chief of the ways, or works of God on earth; for we are told that all things on earth were made for man, and that he was to rule over *all the beasts* of the field, and the fishes of the sea, and the birds of the air. So that behemoth is not, and cannot properly be said to be, *the chief* of the ways of God, unless he be greater than man.

I doubt even whether man himself can be said to be, in the full and broad assertion of this passage, *the chief*, or *greatest* of the ways (works)

of God. Such are some of the grave objections to our present reading of this passage, suggested by the import of the words themselves and by the context.

On the other hand, there are many reasons why this passage should read, "He is the chief of the ways *of power*." In reading this description we notice that its whole tendency is to show that behemoth is the most powerful, heartless and invulnerable of all creatures; that he is made without fear, and that on earth there is not his like. Iron is to him as straw, and brass as rotten wood. It would, therefore, be most natural to say of such a monster, that he was the chief of the ways of power, but not "chief of the ways of God." Then, on the other hand, this powerful creature does not appear, up to the present day, to have been discovered among any of the animals which God created, neither is it stated that he was *created*. This lessens still more his claim to being *the chief* of the ways of God. Moreover, there has appeared, within our days, a monster of power, with iron flanks and bones of solid metal; on earth there is not his like, neither has the deep ever been lashed by such a fearless monster.

He bids fair to outrival all competitors and to prove himself to be the long-sought-for behemoth. Yet he is not a *created* being, endowed with intelligence, perfect in all his parts. He is but a manufactured monster, an engine of power. Even of him it cannot be said, "He is the chief of the ways of God." But we must acknowledge

that nothing could be more appropriate than to call him the "chief of the ways or methods of power." In fact we will see that, under the head of leviathan, he is called "The King over all conceptions of power."

Therefore I feel convinced that, in this instance, the word (אֵל) *el*, is intended to denote *power*, physical strength.

In this passage I take the word (רֵאשִׁית) *reshith*, as meaning *chief*, *greatest*, *most excellent*, *a masterpiece*. It has also the meaning of *first* in point of time. The Vulgate renders by "Ipse est principium viarum Dei." The Septuagint; "Τουτεστιν αρχη πλασματος Κυριου." Lit: "This one is a masterpiece of workmanship of the Lord." I take the word (αρχη) to mean here, *the first*, in point of excellency, i. e., a masterpiece. So does the French version, "C'est le chef-d'œuvre du *Dieu* Fort." As to the meaning of the expression, "ways of God," or "ways of power," we will find that the word *way* or *ways* is of very comprehensive signification, meaning, a passage or road; direction of motion; manner or method of doing, etc., etc. The latter meaning would be the most intelligible in connection with the word *power;* thus, "He is a masterpiece of the methods of power." i. e., of the methods of *obtaining* power. "In Scripture," says Webster, "the ways of God are his providential government or his works."

Prof. Lee, in his exposition of the meaning of this passage, says, that in the sense of *He is the head* or *first of the ways of God*, it can fairly be applied

neither to the hippopotamus, nor to any other animal or class of animals. "Bochart intimates," says he "that, as others were created on the sixth day, but the hippopotamus, being an aquatic animal, was produced on the fifth; it may hence be termed *first*. But this does not necessarily follow; for, first, if the "ways of God" are to be referred to creation generally, surely the *first* of these must have been the creation of the heavens and the earth, not of a certain aquatic animal. And, secondly, although the hippopotamus is an aquatic animal occasionally—being amphibious—it cannot hence be presumed that he must have been created on the fifth day; or, which is the same thing, that he was produced by the waters, rather than by the earth.

"The other instance adduced, viz: Numb. xxiv. 20, is equally inconclusive; for Amalek could neither be the first of nations, in point of date, nor yet one of *the most* noble of nations. For first, Amalek was the son of Eliphaz (Gen. xxxvi. 12). That nation could have been formed, therefore, only during the sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt, and under circumstances by no means favorable to the rapid increase of any people. They must, therefore, have been greatly inferior to Egypt, Babylon, and many other nations then in existence; and, for the same reason, they could with no propriety be termed the *first* in point of date. I conclude, therefore, that (רֵאשִׁית) *reshith*, must here, *i. e.*, Numb. xxiv. 20, be used in a sense totally different from that

assumed by Bochart. Balaam, I think, must have meant, that as Amalek was the *first of the nations who opposed the Israelites in their journeying through the desert*, their doom was, therefore, that they should perish forever."

This is sufficient to show that, in this instance, the expression. "*he is the first*," cannot be interpreted as referring to the time when the behemoth was created. Moreover, as I have shown, it is not satisfactorily established that he was ever created, or that such an animal was ever known on earth.

Therefore, from the evident reference of this description and from the context, I conclude that our present rendering has no good authority to rest on, whilst there are abundant reasons and proof that it should read, "He (or it) is chief of the ways (methods) of power."

Hoping to have settled the meaning of the word (אֵל) *el*, as meaning here, *power*, *strength*, now the expression, *ways of power*, will be readily understood to refer to the *methods*, or, *ways* of *obtaining* power.

As you have just noticed, Prof. Lee decides that this passage can fairly be applied neither to the hippopotamus nor to any other animal in the sense of "he is the head or first of the ways of God."

Moreover, if this passage was intended to refer to the great power of *an animal*, as some suppose, why was it not said that he was the most powerful of all animals, which would have been easily

understood, and have helped to prove that the behemoth *was* an animal.

As to the possibility of the hippopotamus being referred to here, I would say, that he cannot be shown to be the chief of the ways of power, not even the *chief* of the *animals* of power. For it is evident that animals have existed which were far superior, in size and power, to any now in existence.

But let us see if any objections can be found to the application of this passage to our own monster of power.

It is said, as I have just shown, that the behemoth *is chief of the methods of power*. This can, very naturally, be interpreted to mean that he is *the greatest of all contrivances of power*. The steam engine, as we all know, derives its power from the expansive force of steam generated from water, by the application of heat.

This force is capable of being accumulated until it reaches an enormous degree of pressure; in fact, it is limited only by the capacity of iron or steel to withhold. Boilers and engines of several hundred horse-power are very common.

Up to the present day no other force has been discovered which for power, economy and safety can compare with steam. It does outrival all competitors on sea and on land, and bids fair to remain the power of the nations.

An ordinary steam engine and boiler can accomplish more work, or generate more potential energy in one day than a thousand hippopotami.

All the animals of the forests could not equal, this day, the combined power of steam. In the way of strength there is no creature on earth capable of competing with it.

Such being the facts concerning the power and strength of our steam motor, can any valid objections be raised to its being called, "the chief of the methods of power," or, "the greatest of all the contrivances of power."

Certainly, no one will deny that, up to the present, nothing has been known to equal it. Even should some other motor be found to supersede it in some respects, are we sure that it could fulfill all the requirements of this description. As matters stand, our great steam motor can also be said to be "chief of the ways of God"—viz: chief among His providential ways for the benefit and pleasure of man.

As to the second part of the verse, it is still more difficult to understand than that which we have just seen; and commentators do not throw much light on its meaning. In the English version it reads: "He that made him can make his sword to approach unto him." Here again occurs, as you will notice, the expression *to make*, *i. e.*, he that *made* him, but not he that *created* him. In the original it is the same word to which I called your attention in the explanation of the first verse of this description. But who can form an opinion of what is meant by saying: "He that made him can make his sword to approach unto him."

A more literal rendering would be: "The one making him will apply (approach) his sword."

It is the Lord Himself who is here speaking; yet it would seem as though He were referring to some one else as the maker of this behemoth, and as the one who would apply this sword to him.

Such ambiguity would certainly be objectionable and highly improbable as the original utterances of the Creator Himself, unless He referred, indeed, to some piece of mechanism and to the maker thereof, who would furnish it, or cause to approach unto it, some sort of destructive power, here called, figuratively, *a sword*, the emblem of death and destruction. And here, I believe, we will find the solution to this problem.

It cannot be denied, that the Lord Himself says here that, the one that maketh this monster will apply his sword, or will furnish him with his sword. Neither will it be denied that, unless He spoke here of a third person, and not of Himself, such an abrupt change from the first to the third person, would be entirely uncalled for, ambiguous, and likely to lead to a misunderstanding.

We would certainly expect the Lord to have expressed Himself quite differently had He intended to refer to the question of His creating and destroying this monster.

We might suppose, for instance, that He would have said: "I, who have created him, have made his sword to approach unto him." But, singu-

larly enough, the original is again in my favor, as it clearly intimates here, that this monster of power is to be furnished, in the future, with some terrible destructive power; and that this will be applied by the one that *makes* him; not by the one who *had made*, or who *had created him*.

Up to the present it has been generally considered that this *sword* referred to some destructive means by which the Lord would destroy this monster, notwithstanding his invulnerability. Such are the views of Adam Clarke; he says: "No power of *man* or *beast* can overcome him. God alone can overcome him, and God alone could *make his sword* (of extinction) approach to him."

Although this is undoubtedly the true sense in which the word *sword* has been used here, viz., distress and destruction, yet it does not appear to me that this power of destruction came directly from God; but rather that it was one that pertained to the nature of this monster, his own great destructive power; and, that the one who would make him would cause this great power to become the cause of his destruction.

Among those who look upon the word *sword* as referring to some attribute of the behemoth is Bochart, who renders this passage thus: "He that made him furnished him with a sword."

Prof. Lee, indorsing the same views, has: "His maker hath given him his weapon." Umbreit has: "His creator hath bestowed on him his sword." These, and many others, such as

Schultens and Rosenmüller, entertain the same views. Therefore, it seems quite probable that the expression *his sword* refers to some great and destructive power belonging to the behemoth. Taking this for granted, it would appear, then, that *the one making* this monster will, in some way or other, apply to him his dangerous and destructive power, or something that will be apt to destroy him. Let us now see if the nature of this destructive power cannot be ascertained from what is said of the peculiarities of this monster in other parts of this description.

We have seen, in the sixteenth verse of this chapter, that there was confined some very mysterious power within the encircling parts of the belly of this monster. We have noticed some similar force referred to (chap. xl. 16,) as *confined air*, or *vapor*, not allowed to escape through the laps of his shields; the latter being sealed tightly for the very purpose of preventing this mysterious force from escaping. Job is undoubtedly reminded of the terrible danger of this same internal and mysterious power, when he is told (chap. xli. 8): "Place thy hand upon him; be mindful of the battling forces *within*, and thou wilt venture no further."

Evidently the very nature of this mysterious and destructive force is revealed to us in chap. xli. 20, where we read: "Out of his nostrils will issue forth smoke as out of a boiling pot or caldron." And what is the smoke that issues from a boiling pot, if not STEAM? We are all

acquainted with its terribly destructive power, and when we look upon this behemoth of Job as being our own monster of power, we can fully realize, without any further explanation, how well it can be called *his sword* of destruction.

We have further, in this same description (chap. xli. 26), strong and convincing evidence that this *sword* does refer to the destructive power of steam; and even how it becomes to be the destruction of this monster. It reads: "From dryness (lack of water) rendering him furious, he will not have power to withhold." Here, then, is the whole secret revealed.

This monster's destruction will be caused by a lack of water rendering him so furious, that he cannot withhold, or endure, any longer.

The word (חרב), which occurs in the above verse, and which I render *dryness*, may mean either *a sword* or *dryness*, as I will show hereafter; yet strange, in both cases they evidently refer to the same power of destruction.

Nothing can reveal to us so well the full force and reference of this passage as its application to the well-known peculiarities of our own monster of power. The statement that *dryness*, or a lack of water, *renders him furious*, is evidence that water is essential to the leviathan. And so we find it to be with our iron monster. Water is his power—his very life. Without it he is left in the greatest of distress, entirely helpless; he cannot even move a limb or utter the faintest sound. Of all creatures he is weakened and dis-

tressed the most for want of water. As soon as he begins to get dry he loses all power over himself, and in a moment all the movable parts of his body become rigid. But, whilst actively at work, should his supply of water fail too suddenly, his rage will become so great that, all of a sudden, he will lose all control over himself, and, bursting his body asunder, he will scatter it in all directions.

It is well known to any one familiar with the management of a steam boiler that, if the water in the boiler is allowed to run too low, it is liable to be vaporized too suddenly, and the outlets not being sufficiently large to allow it to escape, the enormous pressure, thus suddenly generated, tears it to pieces. Indeed, in this sense, one can realize the full meaning and reference of the words of the Lord when he said: "He that maketh him will apply *unto him* his power of destruction," viz., fire and water.

Man, who is the maker of this terrible engine of power, has endowed it with such active and dangerous forces that they often become the very source of its destruction. In this light we can also understand the reason why the Lord makes here, that heretofore singular and unaccountable allusion to another, besides himself, as the maker of the behemoth. Undoubtedly the expression *to make* is intended here in a more limited sense than it is in the first verse of this description.

Here then, once more, our modern monster helps to elucidate the meaning of an obscure and almost incomprehensible passage.

Bochart, who supposes that the teeth of the hippopotamus are referred to by the word *sword*, has the following rendering of this passage: "He that made him furnished him with a sword." This translation conveys quite different ideas from what can be strictly inferred from the original Hebrew. It is not "he that made him," but "the one making him," which does not show an action passed and accomplished at the time these words were spoken. Then the verb *to furnish* has here the full force of the future. Then again the original does not read *a sword*, but *his sword*.

The original, therefore, cannot be quoted as a proof that the behemoth was then in existence, or had existed before. From this comparison with the original, Bochart's rendering is found to be too liberal. If made to be literal it would not agree with his views, that the teeth of the hippopotamus are here meant by the word *sword*. It does not seem likely that this word, which occurs here in the singular number, would be used, figuratively, for a great number of teeth. Then again the teeth of the hippopotamus are far from resembling swords. At least they do not any more than the teeth of any other such monsters. Therefore there would be no special or extraordinary reason for likening them to a sword, or speaking of them as something wonderful.

That a comparison may be proper and natural, there should exist some striking analogy between the things compared. It does not seem

proper to liken horns to a sword because they are slightly curved or tapering; were they exceedingly sharp and their ends very penetrating, there would be some propriety for the comparison. I might understand how the word *sword* might be used, figuratively, for the horn of a unicorn, or for the weapon of a sword-fish, but not for the four unsightly teeth of a hippopotamus. At least I cannot accept it as such in this instance; if the word was in the plural the learned quotations of Bochart might have more force.

That the teeth of the hippopotamus should be likened by historians to a hook, or to some curved instrument for reaping or tearing to pieces—for such is the primary meaning of (ἅρπη) *arpe*, which he quotes—may be very natural and proper, but it is no conclusive evidonce that the Hebrew word is to be taken here as referring to the teeth of that animal. Moreover, as I have shown, Bochart cannot, with any pretension to accuracy, place such a construction as he has upon the original Hebrew. Even then if we simply add to his own rendering the words *his teeth*, instead of *his sword*—as he claims this to be the meaning of the latter—we will at once notice the weakness of his version. It would then read: "He that made him furnished him with his teeth." And what an improbable and uncalled-for explanation, specially when we consider that the Lord Himself is speaking. For this would make it appear as though the Lord wished

Job to distinctly understand that He had endowed this monster with teeth, or that, indeed, another had done so.

Even if, in this instance, we give Bochart the benefit (?) of the literal translation, his views will not appear as favorably. For then the passage would read: "The one making him will apply (or approach) his teeth." This would be not only improbable as coming from the Lord Himself, but out of place in such a sublime description as this. Neither can we understand how it could be said of the hippopotamus that, the one making him, will apply unto him the power of his own destruction. Yet such is the case with the steam engine.

The word *sword*, taken in the sense of *a power of destruction*, applies in a very striking manner to the terribly destructive powers of steam. That we may duly appreciate this, we have but to read the daily accounts of the terrible accidents which happen from the explosion of the pent-up forces of steam. We will then fully realize that these almost unlimited forces must be classed among our greatest *powers of destruction*. Yea, the makers of the behemoth and leviathan furnish them with their own most terrible powers of destruction. And these ambitious and fearless monsters, too anxious to outdo their competitors, often inflate themselves to such an extent that they burst their irons bands asunder and carry devastation on all sides. What a monster! And what a terrible sword he carries at his side!

Thus we may easily recognize how fully he answers this description, and fulfills, not only the requirements of the original text, but the very poetical sentiments which pervade this whole description. In him only can we recognize the beauty of the original, when it says: "He is a masterpiece of the methods of power; he that maketh him will apply unto him his sword *of destruction*."

THEY WILL BRING TO HIM THE WEALTH OF THE MOUNTAINS.

Verse 20.

כִּי־טָל	For, the wealth, produce	Herbas
הָרִים	of the mountains	montes
יִשְׂאוּ־לוֹ	they will bring forth to him;	ferunt huic;
וְכָל־חַיַּת	and all the beasts, animals	omnes bestiæ
הַשָּׂדֶה	of the fields	agri
יְשַׂחֲקוּ־	will wear away, skip away	ludent
שָׁם׃	at that time, there.	ibi.

"Surely the mountains bring him forth food, where all the beasts of the field play."

You will notice in the above renderings of the Vulgate and English versions that there is, evidently, a want of relation between the ideas expressed in the two members of the verse. For, what could be meant by saying that, "where all the beasts of the field play, surely the mountains bring him forth food." Such is indeed their meaning. This inverting of the order of the two passages renders their discordance more prominent. It would seem that if the idea were that this monster *grazed* on the mountains among other *wild* beasts, that this fact would have been expressed quite differently. What could the play-

ing of *field* animals have to do with the production of his food by the mountains. Then again it is remarkable that it is not said that the behemoth *goes* on these mountains in search of his food, but that these bring food *to him.*

Neither is it said that these mountains are the grazing fields of these beasts, but, very strangely, that it is there they *all play;* which not only seems improbable but entirely foreign to the subject matter.

There would seem to be something strange also about this monster's food, as it is said to be a special product of the mountains; for it may be supposed that, were it grass, there would have been no necessity for mentioning any special locality; in fact more grass and shrubbery grow in the plains and valleys than on the mountains. Then, why this second allusion to this creature's food when, in the first verse of this description, we were told that he consumed *fodder* as well as cattle do?

Such are a few of the difficulties met with in this verse, when we endeavor to fathom its meaning from our present translations.

Undoubtedly a different interpretation of the original is necessary in order to throw the required light on this passage.

The word (בּוּל) *bhoul*, rendered *food*, is not generally made use of in that sense, but rather in that of *produce*, *increase;* from the root (יָבַל) *yabhal*, meaning *to flow*, *to overflow.*

But I am of the opinion that the proper mean-

ing of the word here will be found in Job, chapter xx. 28; where it is said: "The increase (יְבוּל), of his house departs;" meaning *the wealth* laid up in his house.

Prof. Lee takes almost the same view of the word, and says in reference to it: "The truth seems to be, that *abundance*, *excess*, or the like, is the idea prevailing in this word."

The Vulgate renders *herba*, but nowhere else do I find it interpreted in that restricted sense.

The word (נָשָׂא) *nasa*, rendered *to bring*, means primarily *to take up*, *to lift up;* then *to bring*. As it is in the third person plural, future, we should render *they will take up*, or *bring* (לוֹ) *to him*. In this sense, which is undoubtedly the proper one, the word *mountains* cannot be the subject of this verb, as all versions make it appear. For the original word does not mean *to bring forth*, in the sense of *to produce*, but *to take up to*, *to bring to* any one, etc.

From this meaning of the words it becomes evident that the word mountains, is in the genitive, which gives us, "They will bring to him the wealth, or, produce, of the mountains."

Although, as you will notice, it is not directly stated in what this *wealth*, or *abundance* of the mountains consisted, yet the fact cannot be denied that, whatever it was, it had to be taken up, or *brought forth to him*. And, as the verb here does not indicate the action of *producing*, but that of *carrying* or *bringing* from one place to another, it must be inferred that this action of bringing

forth these products to this monster, must have been performed by men.

Another important inference which can be drawn from the above meaning of the words is, that the original does not refer, exclusively, to the products which grow on the surface of the mountains, but may also refer to such as have to be *excavated* from them, and here called *the wealth* of the mountains.

If we reflect but a moment, we cannot help recognizing here a direct reference, not only to the products of the fields, but also to the vast wealth which has been for centuries, and is yet this day, excavated from the mountains and mountainous countries, in the shape of iron, coal, granite, gold, silver and the like, which may, indeed, be very appropriately called the *wealth* of the mountains. Now if we apply to these products the meaning of the root of the word by which they are here designated, viz., *to flow;* we find it to apply to them in a no less wonderful manner, since geologists inform us that there is abundant proof that at one time during the earth's formation, all these were in a molten condition, many of them virtually *flowing* from the craters and fissures of the mountains.

From this it would appear that the behemoth was a domestic animal, or some powerful machine to which the people carried these materials and products of the mountains, either for exportation, or for this monster's own use.

A proof that the original was not understood,

and that there was great difficulty in applying it to such an animal as this description was supposed to refer, may be readily seen from the various comments and renderings we have of this passage.

An old French version renders it thus: "Et les montagnes lui rapportent leur revenu." The writer, as you notice, does not seem to have understood the original word (בּוּל) *bhoul*, to mean only *herbes* or *grass*, but any product or revenue of the mountains.

Prof. Lee goes to great length to show that the above word has been misunderstood; he says: "Nothing can be more blind than the account given of this second word in the dictionaries. 'Proventus terræ,' says Gesenius, 'a rad. יָבַל ut תְּבוּאָה, proventus, a בּוֹא.' But here neither the forms nor the sense are analogous. Winer gives 'Proventus ex Chald. (Talm.) linguæ usu;' and ends with 'Alii; proventus arboris, h. e. lignum, quod magis placet.' Under יָבַל, Gesenius gives '*fluxit*, maximè, copiosè at cum quodam impetu; Arab . . . copiosè fluxit, pluit,' etc. But no Arabian author gives *fluxit* for the sense of this word, as far, at least, as I can discover."

Contrary to Prof. Lee's views, I find that *fluxit* would agree very well here in the sense of *the flowing wealth* of the mountains, as I have shown.

The Septuagint, in their rendering of this passage, differ widely from all others. They have: "Επ᾽ελθων δε επ᾽ορος ακροτομον, επoιησε χαρμονην τετραποσίν εν τω ταρταρω," which I translate: "And ascending, (or going beyond) the rugged mountains, he causeth joy to the

quadrupeds in the wilderness." This extraordinary difference between the Hebrew and Septuagint can only be explained on the ground that the latter found, in the original, something hard to understand or rather contrary to their views of the reference of this description. Had it been evident that the meaning was, "Surely the mountains bring him forth food," there could have been no reason for them to object to it. But if they found, as I do, that it meant that men would bring forth the wealth of the mountains *to him*, or *for him*, it is easy to understand that they would prefer rendering by some non-committal phrase; as they had already viewed him as a wild monster, (θηρια.)

That the hippopotamus is referred to here, is out of the question. It is well known to be, essentially, an aquatic animal, and cannot wander far from water. No historian has ever represented this animal as being in the habit of climbing high mountains, or as going far into the interior of countries in quest of food. Neither is he known to graze among wild beasts of the forest, for he never herds together with other animals. Adam Clarke and many others agree that he is seldom found far from the rivers where he has his chief residence.

Then, the people of those countries do not take the trouble to bring to him the products of the mountains, as is evidently the case with the monster referred to here.

Prof. Lee (page 250) remarks :" Again, certain parts of the description given in this place cannot

apply to the hippopotamus; e. g. v. 20. *The mountains bear provisions for him;* for this obvious reason, that it is never found grazing on the mountains at all. All that is said of the hippopotamus is, that it is often seen grazing on the banks of the Nile, or other rivers, but surely these cannot be termed the mountains on which *all* the wild beast do gambol and play. By this latter description one would suppose were meant those mountainous districts which are far removed from the natural haunts of the hippopotamus, but in which the wild horse, the onager, etc., are found. I conclude, therefore, that the hippopotamus is not exclusively spoken of in this description."

By the above comparisons and quotation I have not only shown the weakness of such various renderings and pointed out their wide departure from the original Hebrew version, but I hope to have also established the fact, contended for by many learned writers on the subject, that this verse cannot apply to the hippopotamus.

There now remains for me but to show that the words of the original text apply, with precision, to our great and modern creature of power, the steam engine.

According to the original, then, it would seem as though men would bring forth to this monster, or *for him*, the wealth or the produce of the mountains.

Now, could this be said of any known animal with as much propriety as of our modern steam monster? Behold the enormous quantity of iron,

coal, marble, gold, silver, etc., which is being daily brought forth to him from the mountains, and by him rendered most available. It can also be said with great propriety, that it is *for him*—the steam engine—that much of this precious wealth of the mountains is excavated, such as the coal it consumes, and the iron and copper which is needed for its own construction. In this sense also it can be said that, indeed, the mountains furnish, or bring forth its food, viz., coal, which is really the food which our monster consumes, and which is brought from the mountains both *for him* and *by him*. I believe that the hoisting up of coal from the coal-pits of England was one of the first practical purposes to which steam was applied.

In the sense of "they will bring forth to him the produce of the mountains," this passage suits our powerful monster, in a pre-eminent degree. Witness in all fertile countries, where our steam railroads have penetrated, how the inhabitants bring forth to him their overflowing products of all kinds. What an enormous quantity of wheat and corn; what a variety of vegetables and fruits are daily brought to him to be carried to the great markets of the world. Indeed, he is the common carrier of the nations.

From these facts we cannot help concluding that nothing has yet been discovered which so fully and minutely fills every requisite, and elucidates every dark passage of this wonderful description, as our modern steam motor.

Let us now pass over to the investigation of th

second hemistich of this verse, which, I presume, will also reveal some wonderful truth in connection with our fiery monster.

Most of our English versions read: "Where all the beasts of the field play," which is also the rendering of the Vulgate, as can be seen at the head of this verse. I cannot help expressing my surprise at the strange turn which translators and expositors have given to this part of the verse; for its construction, in the original, is simple, and the meaning of each word is easily understood. Had it been translated verbatim, it certainly would have been more applicable to a terrible wild beast than the versions we have before us.

To prove this, I will translate each word in its natural rotation, just as it occurs in the Hebrew; and give the meaning of each word precisely as found in the lexicons.

It reads: "And all the beasts of the field will wear away (or, skip away) at that time (or, there)."

Certainly the meaning is plain enough; and, moreover, there is nothing in the context which demands any different construction to be placed upon these words. Those who look upon the behemoth as a powerful and terrible wild beast might, with more propriety, have interpreted this to mean, that all the beasts of the field would wear away there, or from there, viz., from the mountains, than to have twisted it to mean, "where all the beasts of the field *play*."

It is evident that the difficulty was with the word (שָׂחַק) *sachak*, *to play*, *to gambol;* which evi-

dently should have been (שָׁחַק) *shachak, to wear away*, or *to wear out*, as a garment. The same word occurs in Job xiv. 19: "Waters (שָׁחֲקוּ) *shachakou, wear away* the stones." In the present hemistich it occurs in the third person plural, future tense, *they will wear away*. The meaning of (שָׁם) *sham*, is, *there, then, at that time*. I take the latter to be its meaning here. Thus it will read: "And all the beasts of the field will wear away at that time, or, there."

This frees the verse from the many objections raised to our numerous and various translations of it. Moreover, it discloses two distinct ideas.

First, that the wealth or produce of the mountains will be brought forth unto him.

Second, that at the time of his appearance the wild beasts of the fields and of the forests would gradually wear away.

This rendering would also have the merit of agreeing with the nature and capacities of the monster which I contend is referred to here.

I am confident that no one will dispute this; whilst, on the contrary, many of our most learned authors cannot agree as to its reference to the hippopotamus, or to any other animal.

On the other hand, the striking application of this passage to the results which follow everywhere the introduction of steam power or the locomotive, is so evident that it scarcely needs to be pointed out.

Many still remember the great opposition that was at first made to the introduction of locomo-

tives and railroads on this very plea, viz., *that it would frighten all the animals from the fields.* And here we have it plainly foretold that in the days of the so-called *behemoth* the animals of the fields would wear away and disappear. The application of this passage may also be very appropriately referred to domestic animals. For in these days, when everything is done by steam, all animals of burden, such as the horse, the mule, etc., gradually wear away from the roads and places where steam power is introduced to do the work which was once done by them.

Moreover, steam, in its great mission of spreading civilization and causing wild but fertile countries to be cleared, cultivated and inhabited, does thereby cause the wild beasts to disappear from them. Even his very presence is sufficiently terrible to cause the most ferocious and powerful animals to flee in terror from before him. The mere utterance of his voice causes the lion to tremble. None of them dare stand before him at his approach.

As a prophecy, this passage is certainly being rapidly fulfilled in our days, when, through the rapid spreading of the nations and their civilization, the wild beasts of the forests and of the mountains are rapidly *wearing away* from their haunts.

How applicable, then, to our days, as well as to our famous monster, these words of Job: "Surely they will bring forth unto him the wealth of the mountains; and, at that time, the beasts of the field will wear away."

HE IS PLACED UNDER SHELTER AND COVERED WITH CLAY.

Verse 21.

תַּחַת־	Under, beneath	Sub
צְאֲלִים	light shelters, sheds,	umbra
יִשְׁכָּב	he will rest, lie down,	dormit,
בְּסֵתֶר	within a covering *made*	in secreto
קָנֶה	of a fibrous reed	calami et in
וּבִצָּה׃	and clay,—mud.	locis humentibus.

"He lieth under the shady trees, in the covert of the reed and fens."

It certainly does not seem, at first sight, as though this verse, as it reads in most of our translations, could ever be interpreted to suit any of the known peculiarities of our steam engine and boiler. For it neither sleeps nor lies down, as made to appear in the above rendering of the Latin and English. Neither is it to be found hidden in the midst of reeds and fens.

Those who looked upon the hippopotamus as the one alluded to in this description, found in this, strong evidence in favor of their views; although the word (צְאֲלִים) *tsaalim*, rendered *shady trees, shades;* has caused some difference of opinion to arise among many learned authors as to what might be its real meaning. Some translate *lotus*,

or *wild lotus*, such as Gesenius, Noyes, Prof. Lee and Schultens. Bochart, Rosenmüller and others render it by *shades*. The Vulgate, *umbra*, *shade*. The Septuagint are still different from all these, they read "υπο παντοδαπα δενδρα κοιμαται." He sleeps under all kinds of trees. As this seems to be the only instance in the Scriptures where this word occurs, it becomes difficult to ascertain its precise meaning.

According to Schultens and Gesenius, it is derived from the obsolete word (צָאַל) *tsaal*, *to be thin*, *slender;* in Arabic it is applied to the wild lotus. Some consider it of little importance whether it be rendered *the lotus*, or *shades*, though they suppose that the *probable* derivation of the word favors the former.

Contrary to the latter opinion I would say that the true meaning and reference of the word becomes now of great importance, especially since a modern and most peculiar creature in his habits is contending for the honors so long bestowed on the wild monsters of the Nile.

In reference, then, to the word (צָאַל) *tsaal*, it is well to notice that its true meaning is not known, and its reference to the lotus, or to reeds, or shades, is doubtful. It seems reasonable to suppose that if the lotus, or common marshy reeds, had been meant, no such doubtful word would have been used.

Prof. Lee, objecting to those who translate by *shade*, or *shadows*, says, "Besides, to say in the very next verse that *the shadows cover* him *with their shade*, would be to speak in a very extra-

ordinary way, and certainly very unlike the style of this book. One would suppose that (עַרְבֵי־נָחַל) *arebha-nachal*, *willows of the torrent*, would here, in one way or the other, supply a sense not unlike that of the preceding parallel; certainly *shadows* will not suit this place."

So this learned author is also puzzled as to the nature of the things which formed a covering for this wonderful creature.

Neither does Adam Clarke appear to have been certain of the meaning of this passage, for he dismisses the entire verse with these few words, "This and the following verses refer to certain habits of the behemoth with which we are and must be unacquainted."

Certainly this is not saying much in favor of the views entertained on this passage by others before him. Undoubtedly this verse, as well as the following one, is very difficult to understand and still more so to render literally.

Regardless of what creature may be here alluded to, it seems evident that the first member of this verse refers to some sort of a sheltering underneath which he dwells, and that the things constituting this shelter were *thin*, *slender*. Then the second member seems to indicate that, moreover, there was another sort of covering, *inside* of which he was; and that this later covering was of *clay*, or *mud*, and also of *reeds*.

This creature, then, would seem to rest under two different coverings. This fact, although not distinctly alluded to by any commentator, can

still be easily detected in their explanations and renderings of this verse. For instance you will notice it in our English versions. They say, first, that "he lieth under the shady trees;" then, that he is "in the covert of the reed and fens." It seems to me doubtful that just such a condition of large shady trees, and reeds and fens exists, especially in reference to the resting-place of the hippopotamus. I doubt that the reed supposed to be here referred to, viz., the cane, grows under large shady trees, and that these grow in the fens on the banks of the Nile; for this verse requires this peculiar interpretation, if the hippopotamus, or some such animal, be here alluded to.

The difficulty with this word rendered *shady trees*, is, that it seems to be an adjective in the plural, meaning *thin*, *slender;* and that the noun which it should serve to qualify is not expressed. According to the general drift of this verse, the word would seem to refer to something which constituted some sort of a covering spread over and above this monster. Such a connection of ideas would suggest, in our days, *thin strips of timber*, *slender* boards, *shingles* and the like; such as are generally adapted to the construction or covering of a place or shelter, as *a shed*, for instance.

Even the word *shed* would seem to answer very well here, as it denotes *a slight building*—according to Webster's definition. This would be in harmony with the context which indicates that this word refers to some sort of a sheltering place for this monster.

Gesenius, in his lexicon, gives to the root (צָאַל) *tsaal* the meaning of *to be thin*, *slender*, and as being of kindred meaning with (צָנַן) *tsanan*, *to be sharp;* being the same as (גָּנַן) *ganan*, *to cover to protect.* Hence (צִנָּה) *tsannah*, *a shield.* Our *slim* wooden shingles would suit each of the above meanings. They are *thin* and *sharp* at one end; they serve as a *covering* and *protection.* Moreover, a roof of shingles has much the appearance of a large *shield* made of small thin pieces united together.

Instead of "He lieth under the shady trees," we should read, "He will lie down, or, he will rest." Prof. Lee renders "Beneath *the* wild lotus doth he couch."

The Vulgate has: "He sleepeth under the shade." If this was the meaning intended, I cannot see why such a simple thing should be noticed at all; for it certainly could not be accounted as an extraordinary thing in this creature to lie down to sleep in the shade, when animals, in general, naturally seek a shady place to rest.

From the extraordinary and peculiar things we have already seen mentioned in this description concerning the habits of the behemoth, we would also expect that the resting-place of this singular creature would be different from all others. Undoubtedly it is on this very account that Job's attention is called to it.

Strange to say, the rendering and application which I propose, fulfill these expectations, and also all the requirements of the case; for, accord-

ing to the above, this passage would mean, "He will rest under light shelters, or, under slender sheltering places." This would certainly be a strange and unexpected sort of a lair for a wild creature of the forests, or a monster of the deep; yet, as we will see, not so improbable in reference to the construction of the sheltering place of our own monster of power, the stationary engine and boiler. It does not consist of whole trees or branches, but according to the evident meaning of the words of our prophet, of thin or slender pieces, thin strips of timber, thin boards and shingles.

Under a sheltering formed of these he actually rests. When one views this passage as referring to a stationary engine and boiler, that is, one set up to remain in a certain locality, he at once understands why special mention is here made of this resting place. As Job is about to give us a description of the various purposes to which this creature of power will be applied, he begins very ingenously by describing him as he appeared under those various circumstances.

Here, for instance, it is the stationary engine and boiler, and he represents it as resting under a shelter of thin boards and shingles. This fact will be fully confirmed by what follows in the second member of this verse, and it will be found to be no less astonishing than what we have just been told.

According to our English translations the balance of this verse reads: "In the covert of the

reed and fens." The first objection I have to this translation is the use of the definite article *the*, before *covert* and *reed*. These words are not thus specially designated in the original, neither does there appear to be any necessity for it. The second objection is to the word *reed*. The original cannot, in this instance, have the meaning of *a reed*.

If so, it would have been in the plural form. The word rendered *fens* is also in the singular. Prof. Lee renders the latter by *mire*. The Septuagint have, "among the papyrus and the reed and the cane."

Let us now refer to the original Hebrew. The expression (בְּסֵתֶר) *besether*, rendered *in the covert*, means *in*, or, *within a covering;* the latter seems to be the meaning intended here.

As to the word (קָנֶה) *kaneh*, I am satisfied that it is not intended to refer here to cane stalks, but to reeds in general, and more probably to fibrous reeds, or to a *texture* or *covering* made of such fibres, and which closely enveloped this monster's body.

From the original wording of this passage it would seem as though this *fibrous covering* was mixed with clay, (בִּצָּה) *soft clay*, rendered so by the addition of water. By cutting off (ב) *beth*, as a prefix preposition, we would have (צָה) *tsah*, which means *white*, *reddish white*, *dry*. As in this form it is an adjective, the entire expression would mean, *and in something white* or *dry*. So that this second covering *within* which this monster was, would seem to have been made of fibrous

reeds, or of the fibres of reeds, mixed with clay or with something white.

What will our late inventors think of this? Here, evidently, is described some of our lately invented processes for covering boilers so as to prevent too great a radiation of heat and waste of fuel. Job describes this covering as being made of fibrous reeds and clay, the very essential parts of most of our late inventions, which contain jute, hemp, manilla and other like fibrous substances, mixed with clay and other non-conductors of heat; some of which are perfectly white, such as a composition of magnesia which was lately shown to me. Moreover, the clay, which we find mentioned in this passage as part of its covering, may also refer to the bricks and mortar with which most of our stationary boilers are covered.

Here, then, we cannot help recognizing our stationary steam boiler, set up and resting under suitable coverings, or sheds, and *imbedded* in clay and mortar.

I notice that the Vulgate, instead of *mire and fens*, has *in locis humentibus*, as if this monster rested in places where there was water. This view would be also quite applicable to our steam engine which requires an enormous quantity of water, and, in fact, cannot exist where there is no water. Saw-mills and factories, where large engines are used, are generally located on the banks of rivers, or where a plentiful supply of fresh water can be had. They are also located in the midst of large forests of valuable timber

for the purpose of sawing them and making them available for building and other purposes.

In connection with this fact, the rendering of the Septuagint is very remarkable, as it reads: "He rests under trees of different kinds."

It must be admitted that, up to the present day, nothing has been discovered which solves so well the intricacies of this description as our modern monster, as he is actually set to rest under sheltering places, and imbedded under a thick covering of clay or mortar.

This verse has caused me a great deal of vexatious labor, as it has to many others before me; yet I will consider myself well repaid if I have succeeded in satisfying the reader that I have brought out its true meaning, which I consider to be the following:

"He will rest beneath light shelters, and within a covering of fibrous reeds and clay."

HIS SHELTERING PLACE WILL BE COVERED AND INCLOSED.

Verse 22.

יְסֻכֻּהוּ	They will cover, protect	Protegunt
צַאֲלֵי	slender shadings	umbræ
צִלָּלוֹ	his shelter;	umbram ejus;
יְכַבְּהוּ	they will inclose him roundabout	circumdabunt eum
עַרְבֵי־	trees, willows	salices
נָחַל׃	of the valley, brook.	torrentis.

"The shady trees cover him with their shadow; the willows of the brook compass him about."

TAKING this verse as it reads in most translations, it would seem to be but a useless and even more complicated repetition of the ideas already expressed in the previous verse, viz., that "he lieth under the shady trees." Then, again, in the second member of this verse, it is said that "the willows of the brook compass him about;" whilst, to the contrary, in the previous verse it is said that he is "in the covert of the reed and fens." There is evidently something wrong with our ordinary interpretations of these passages. Moreover, if we compare the English translation of the first part of this verse with the original Hebrew, we will find that it is not, strictly, a literal render-

ing. To be such it would have to read, "The shades will cover his shadow." Such is also the rendering of the Vulgate.

But what this means is difficult to fathom. Undoubtedly the whole trouble has been caused by the wrong interpretation of the word (צְאַל) *tsaal*, rendered *shades*, *shady trees*.

If the interpretation I gave of this word in the previous verse, viz., *a shelter*, or *thin slabs of wood*, *thin boards or shingles*, is the proper one, it certainly should solve the difficulties of this passage also; although it is much more complicated by a play on the word. Moreover, in this instance, it is important to notice that these thin coverings are not said to cover this monster, but rather to cover that which shelters him. The difficulty here is, that both the things out of which this shelter or shade is made, and the shelter itself, are designated by the same word.

The only rendering which would seem to solve all the difficulties of this passage would be the following: "Thin shadings will cover his shelter."

Undoubtedly reference is here made to some thin strips of wood, like shingles, for instance, which covered this monster's shelter or shed; the latter being also constructed of thin boards, or slender pieces of timber, as explained in the previous verse.

This seems to be such a direct reference to the covering of the roof of a shed with shingles, or thin strips of wood, that no one can avoid recognizing it. Moreover, it answers every requirement

of this passage and also of the previous ones; in fact, it seems to be the only plausible solution of the difficulties met with in these two verses. There would be no sense in saying "the shady trees cover his shady tree," nor in rendering, "the shadows cover his shadow." And to render it as many do, viz., "The shady trees cover him with their shadow," is not a correct version of the original. Then, again, how could this close covering of shady trees be made to harmonize with what is said in the second member of this verse, where it is distinctly stated that "the willows of the brook (or of the valley) will compass him round about."

In reading over carefully these two verses, the reader will perceive that a condition of things, analogous to the one described in our translations, is not easily conceived, nor likely to be possible. First, this monster would have to be resting under shady trees; then, in a covert of reeds and fens; then again, these same shady trees would have to cover him with their shadow; finally, the willows of the brook would compass him round about.

Could it be possible that such circumlocution would be made use of to describe the well-known and unimportant fact that the hippopotamus hides in marshy reeds and wallows in the mire like a hog? I am convinced that no such reference is intended here.

But how natural and proper every word seems when applied to the resting-place of our monster of power. Let us take him as he appears, for

instance, on the banks of some large stream, in the midst of a large forest, where he is running a saw-mill. There, unlike all other monsters, he is actually at rest under a covert architecturally constructed of thin strips of timber and boards, the roof of which is also covered with thin boards or shingles; the whole structure being *inclosed round about* with heavy planks from *the trees of the valley;* whilst the boiler itself is imbedded in a covering of bricks and mortar. Round about him on all sides are also the tall trees of the valley. This fulfills all the requirements of the case, and I am satisfied that no valid objection can be raised to this interpretation or application of the original; whilst of the hippopotamus I would say that, as he can stay out of the water but a short time, he cannot enjoy very long a sheltering place under the shady trees of the valley; neither could the mud-holes in which he wallows be properly called a sheltering place. As to wild beasts, which inhabit thickets and dense forests, they could not be referred to here, as all admit that the behemoth is amphibious.

Strange to say, there is not a word, in this long and minute description, describing how this wonderful creature reared its young, whilst the author is particular to mention it in his description of the ostrich. What a puzzle it would have been had Job said: "He breedeth not, neither hath he any mate; yet his posterity will be numerous, and overrun the whole earth." It was well for Job, and for us, that he did not mention this

fact, nor the astonishing one that his leviathan would run on wheels; for, surely, his wonderful work would have been consigned to oblivion as chimerical. In this we cannot help recognizing the work of Divine wisdom. It seems impossible that such things as these could have been written, in those days, without having been first dictated word for word.

Every verse of this wonderful description has been so artfully worded that the behemoth has remained a mystery up to the present day.

Undoubtedly it was so intended from the beginning.

I would now offer the following as the meaning of this difficult passage: "Thin shadings will cover his sheltering *place;* the willows of the valley will inclose him round about."

HE WILL ABSORB WITH EASE THE WATERS OF A FLOOD.

Verse 23.

הֵן	Behold, surely	Ecce
יַעְשֹׁק	he will absorb, contend with	absorbebit
נָהָר	a river, torrent	fluvium,
לֹא יַחְפֹּז	and will not fret;	et non mirabitur;
יִבְטַח	He will trust, not fear,	Et habet fiduciam
כִּי־יָגִיחַ	though should rush forth	quod influat
יַרְדֵּן	a river, Jordan	Jordanis
אֶל־פִּיהוּ׃	over its mouth, its border.	in os ejus.

"Behold, he drinketh up a river and hasteth not; he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth."

The peculiar construction of this verse, and the variety of meanings which can be attributed to several of its most important words, seem to have been the chief cause of its having been so variously rendered by translators. Then the uncertainty of the species to which this monster belonged, and of the precise locality he inhabited, rendered it almost impossible to comprehend the true meaning of the original. But now that new ideas concerning the nature of this creature are brought to bear on this difficult problem, it becomes comparatively an easy task to unravel the meaning of these difficult passages.

Still, it often occurs that Divine wisdom has so peculiarly worded these verses that they may be understood to refer to several widely different, yet quite appropriate, characteristics of this monster. For instance, the first part of this verse may mean, "Surely, he will contend with a rapid torrent without making great haste, or great efforts." Again it may as well mean: "Behold, he will absorb, without much inconvenience, an overflowing river." Both of these versions would agree well with the known capacities of our modern steam power.

Steam is capable of navigating against the strongest currents, and without great efforts. Again, by means of our steam pumping engine, the waters of an overflowing stream are soon swallowed up; and the quantity of water he thus absorbs is of no inconvenience to him.

The idea expressed in the Vulgate is this: "Behold, he will absorb a river, and will not make much of it." The Septuagint render: "Should there come a flood he would not fret."

Umbreit has: "Lo, the stream overfloweth; he trembleth not," and explains by saying that, "the sense is, the animal is amphibious."

Bochart, Schultens and others give to it the meaning of, "The stream overfloweth and he feareth not." This and other similar renderings, are not strictly in accordance with the Hebrew, nor with the Vulgate; for in both of these the word *river* is obviously in the objective and not in the nominative case. In other words, it is not said

that the river contends with him, or absorbs him; but that it is behemoth that contends with a river, or absorbs it. And the only reason why some translators have objected to such a reading is because, as Barnes says, "it is impossible to make good sense of the phrase *he oppresseth* a river; nor does the word used properly admit of the translation *he drinketh up*." Had Barnes thought of our powerful steam-pumping engine, how soon he would have realized the propriety of saying that he could *oppose* or *press against* a raging torrent, or *drink up* the waters of an overflowing stream. Behold here in New Orleans, when the great Mississippi overflows its borders, it is the steam-pumping engine that *drinks up* the overflowing waters and *forces them back* into the lake.

It seems to me beyond doubt that most translators understood the original to refer to overflowing streams of water, and to the capacity of this creature to absorb these waters, but the trouble was how to make it agree with the capacities of any known animal. Undoubtedly it must have seemed a folly to them to endeavor to discover any animal that was capable of drinking so much water without inconvenience to himself, or that would make it a pleasing pastime to *force back*, or *drink up* a river that was overflowing its borders. Even a thousand elephants with the power they have of absorbing a large quantity of water with their trunks, and then forcing it out, would not be equal to the task. Yet, such an action on their part, would be a fair illustra-

tration of the idea intended to be conveyed here of the actual doings of the behemoth.

Prof. Lee, commenting on this passage, concludes by giving the following as its probable meaning: "He trusteth that he can maintain his rapid course, even in opposition to the swelling stream of the Jordan." This is certainly a strong corroboration of my views of the possible *double entente* of this passage, as I have explained.

I would also venture to say that there can be found in this same passage a meaning quite different from either of the above. The whole point rests upon the meaning attributed to the Hebrew word (עָשַׁק) *ashak*. Albert Barnes referring to this word, say: "It usually means to oppress, to treat with violence and injustice; and to defraud, or extort." It is in the latter sense that I will now apply it. And, we have as the result, "Behold, he will defraud a swift torrent, or river, without much exertion."

Taken in this sense, it would appear that this monster would have occasion to come in contact with, or to place himself in opposition to, the rivers and that he would defraud them of something that belonged to them; and that he would do this *without much exertion.*

From these last words it would appear as though it was a matter of speed between himself and the rivers, and that he would thus get some advantage over them. How would this agree with our various systems of railroads which have virtually defrauded the rivers out of their ancient rights

of common carriers of the nations?" They have defrauded them of their freight and of their passengers, and *without much exertion*. They can compete with advantage against the swiftest torrents, and yet not make great haste.

In fact the great advantage that railroads have, over river routes, is their speed.

There is certainly no other monster in existence which could fulfill so completely the various meanings which, as I have shown, can be attributed to this passage. Of no animal could it be said, with equal propriety, "He drinketh up a river and hasteth not." Supposing that these expressions be poetical or figurative, they would nevertheless mean that the behemoth drinks an enormous amount of water, and without haste or inconvenience to himself. Even so, could this be more applicable to the hippopotamus than to our monster of power?

Behold the capacity of one of our large steam-pumping engines both for the quantity of water it consumes per day, and the amount it can absorb by pumping, and you will readily notice the beauty and propriety of saying, "he drinketh up a river," or, that 'he can absorb an overflowing river without much exertion, or inconvenience."

Our monster of power drinks up a vast amount of water per day; yet, in the very words of this passage, "he hasteth not" in drinking; for, as every one knows, the water is admitted only gradually into the boiler to supply the amount being vaporized. In this sense how astonishing the foresight

of the prophet in saying that, in drinking "he hasteth not," but absorbs the water gradually. How well a good engineer will appreciate this, he who is constantly on the alert lest his raging monster drink too much, or, still worse, too little. It is the same with the steam pump, it absorbs the water gradually, and *hasteth not* to swallow it all at once.

The second part of this verse has been as variously rendered as the first, and has caused as much vexation to the student.

The ordinary English version reads: "He trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth." Umbreit renders: "He is of good courage though the Jordan reacheth to his mouth."

The Septuagint express the idea thus, "He is confident that the Jordan would fail before his mouth." Undoubtedly the meaning intended to be conveyed by the verb προσκρουω is that the Jordan would *dash in vain* into his mouth, for he would swallow the waters as fast as they came. This is a continuation of the idea expressed by the Septuagint in the first part of the verse, viz.; "Should an inundation occur he would not fret," for he would cause the overflowing water *to fail* before his mouth. In other words, his capacity (his mouth) for absorbing an overflowing stream would be so great that the waters of a flood would not inconvenience him in the least.

Such are the Septuagint's views of the meaning of this verse; and I consider them better than those expressed by any other version or

commentary. Yet they are not a literal rendering of the original, especially of the first part of the verse, although the idea of its referring to an overflowing river, or to an *inundation*, is the correct one. A further proof of this will be seen in the verse which will follow, where the means, which this monster makes use of to dispose of these overflowing waters, are clearly indicated.

The more I read over the second member of this verse the more I am inclined to believe that the original word *to trust*, should be pointed so as to read in Hiphil—he will cause to trust,—Most commentators have looked on the expression, *his mouth*, as referring exclusively to the mouth of the behemoth, whilst it might, and probably has been intended for *the mouth* or rather *the border* of the Jordan, or of any large river. Thus we might render: "He will cause to trust though a river should rush forth over its border." The idea being that, should a river burst forth over it borders, or swell even up to its very border, this monster, on account of his great capacity for absorbing a large quantity of water, would cause the people to trust, or to have confidence that they would not be entirely overwhelmed.

The original word rendered Jordan means, primarily, *a river*, or *any river*, as well as the river Jordan. It is often poetically used for any large river. Such are the views of Gesenius, Bochart, and others. Undoubtedly here, it may be intended for any river which may overflow its borders. Taking the word *mouth* as referring to the bor-

der of a river, it would settle a great many conjectures and difficulties caused by the ordinary rendering of the word, and even render easier the application of this passage to an amphibious animal who could have no fear of a river overflowing its borders; but who could not be expected to keep his mouth open for the waters to flow *into* it. I fail to see how, at all events, an overflowing stream could be supposed to have any more tendency towards an animal's mouth than towards any other part of its body. Against those who suppose that the hippopotamus is here meant, I would say that this monster is certainly not found in the Jordan, nor in *any* large river. Neither would it be singular or wonderful in such an amphibious creature not to be alarmed at an overflowing stream, when he could not fear being harmed by it. Neither is it the habit of the hippopotamus to amuse himself by absorbing the waters of an overflowing river; even so, he certainly could not swallow much without great inconvenience to himself; whilst the monster here referred to is said to absorb the waters of an overflowing river without much exertion or inconvenience.

Viewing this passage as referring to the capacity of a large steam-pumping engine, it becomes quite intelligible how it could be said of it that he causeth the people to trust, though a river should burst over its border; for it can absorb such a vast quantity of water that in a short time it would reduce the flood which, otherwise,

might have proved very disastrous to the people, especially in low grounds where the water might be apt to remain for a long time unless pumped out.

Such is the actual condition of many large cities built in swampy lands which have been reclaimed from the waters by a system of levees or embankments. When there is danger of the waters rushing over these, the only trust of the inhabitants is in their steam-draining machines, which could soon force the water back over the embankments.

In this sense we can appreciate the full beauty and meaning of the words of Job when he said: "Behold, he will absorb an overflowing river without much exertion; he will cause *the people* to trust, though a Jordan should rush forth over its border."

HE WILL GATHER THE OVERFLOWING WATERS THROUGH HIS NOSE.

Verse 24.

בְּעֵינָיו	In his fountains, (eyes)	In oculis ejus
יִקָּחֶנּוּ	he will gather it up	capiet eum
בְּמוֹקְשִׁים	with traps, or, snares	quasi hamo
יִנָּקֹב־	וְנָקַב־ and *with* a perforated	et perforabit in
אַף׃	nose, or, nozzle.	fudibus nares ejus.

"He taketh it with his eyes; his nose pierceth through snares."

ALTHOUGH these last lines are written in a plain modern tongue, yet I doubt very much that the reader can feel satisfied that he understands to what they refer.

Does the pronoun *it* refer here to the Jordan mentioned in the previous verse? If so, then this passage means that the behemoth taketh the Jordan *with his eyes;* which is absurd. If the pronoun refers to the overflowing waters of the Jordan, then how can the behemoth be said to take it with *his eyes?*

Evidently the original word rendered *eyes* must have here some other signification. The Vulgate has: "He will take him in his eyes as if with a hook." Maybe the expression *in his eyes* is here

meant for *in his presence*, *before his eyes*. Even so, to what can the personal pronoun *he* refer to? Naturally it should refer to behemoth, as it has in the nine preceding verses. But the inference to be drawn from the Vulgate is, that it refers to a hunter endeavoring to capture the behemoth with a hook. But this is not warranted by the context, nor by anything which precedes this verse. Such a monster could not be captured by one man with a hook, and before his very eyes. Moreover, in the original the word rendered *hook* is in the plural.

The Septuagint render: "He will take him in his eye." By this rendering they seem to have considered that the expression (בְּמוֹקְשִׁים) *bemokeshim*, *with traps*, *snares*, etc., belonged to the second member of the verse. Such is the view taken of it by most English versions. Yet, its correctness will depend on the meaning which may be attributed to the balance of the verse, which is most difficult to understand as it now appears in theHebrew.

The following French version is far more lucid, and more in keeping with the subject, than any of the above. It reads: "Il l'engloutit en le voyant;" He swallows it at sight. Meaning that behemoth swallows the overflowing water at sight. This is just what we might expect after what we have been told in the previous verse, viz., that he would cause the people to trust though a river should flow over its border.

The circumstances here would go to prove that the reason of the people trusting in him was his

capacity to relieve them of these overflowing waters, which, says the French version, he swallows at sight. Yet this is only giving a fair idea of the drift of this passage, and not its literal meaning. The author, as you will notice, finds no allusion here to the means whereby the behemoth is captured. Neither do I. Those who are of a contrary opinion have to do violence to the text in order to carry out their views. For instance, a marginal reading, quoted by many authors, has: "Will *any* take him in his sight?" The original will not bear this construction. It has not the interrogative form so clearly indicated in at least half-a-dozen places in the balance of this description.

Commenting on the above, Barnes says: "From this marginal reading it is evident that our translators were much perplexed with this passage. Expositors have been also much embarrassed in regard to its meaning, and have differed much in their exposition."

Bochart, in order to make it agree with his hippopotamus, gives it also the interrogative form, viewing it in the sense of a denial of the possibility of capturing this monster by ordinary means. I will show, in the next few pages, that the original needs no such forced construction to make it agree with our modern monster; although I must concede that this verse is an exceptionally difficult one, both on account of its construction and of its brevity. It even seems defective in its second member.

In order to arrive at a correct understanding of this verse, it is necessary to examine closely into the various meanings of each word of the original. This the reader can do by referring to the beginning of this verse, where, as usual, I have given, opposite each Hebrew word, its corresponding meaning in English.

The first word, rendered *eyes*, according to its root, means, primarily, *to flow*, *to flow out;* hence *fountain;* then *eye*. In the sense of *fountains*, they may refer to certain receptacles into which the overflowing water, mentioned in the previous verse, was gathered and then allowed to flow out like a continuous fountain stream; hence their name of fountains. These receptacles might refer to the buckets of a draining-wheel, by means of which the water is gathered up and then allowed to flow out as from so many fountains. Then again, they may refer to some large round openings through which the water continuously flowed out, resembling, in this, large flowing wells or fountains. This idea, which seems most likely to be the one intended here, would answer very well to the draining-pipes of our large steam pumping engines, through which (pipes) a tremendous and continuous stream of water is caused to flow by means of direct-acting pumps or turbine-wheels. No better expression could have been made use of by our great Seer to express the vision of a great volume of water issuing with great force out of pipes, strikingly resembling, indeed, large fountains springing out of the earth.

And these he called *his fountains;* indicating by this expression that he knew that this behemoth was the cause of what he saw, and that these fountains, or draining-pipes, formed a part of his apparatus.

Another cause of annoyance and difficulty to the translator and exegetist, has been the doubtful meaning and reference of the expression (בְּמוֹקְשִׁים) *bemokeshim*, rendered, *in*, or, *with snares*, *traps*, etc. These have generally been considered as referring to the means employed to capture this monster, as we have already seen. I can find no such allusion here, but, to the contrary, a direct reference to some means made use of by this monster himself (the steam-pumping engine), to *ensnare* or *entrap* the water which he forced through his fountains, or draining pipes.

It is quite evident to me that the well-known principle of a suction pump is here referred to; and that these *snares*, or, *traps*, refer to the *valves* or *water-traps* of a pump. Such valves are located within the cavity of a vessel, and are made of plates of metal or of leather. They open upward to admit the water, and close downward to prevent its return; and, indeed, constitute, in this, a regular *trap*, by means of which the water is caught and not allowed to escape, except in the direction intended.

Undoubtedly, few would ever dream of finding, in this difficult passage, so wonderful and accurate a description of the construction and action of a pump. Yet, it must be conceded that this

intrepretation suits exactly all the requirements of the case; besides being a perfectly literal rendering of the original.

In it we also find a natural continuation of the subject alluded to in the previous verse, which is the capacity of this monster for absorbing a large quantity of water. Here are described the means by which he accomplishes this great feat, viz.: "He will gather it up in his fountains by means of traps." The reader will also take notice that the verb here is in the future, thereby indicating that this action had not already occurred, but would at some future time.

The second part of this verse is as difficult, if not more so, than the first, and has been as variously rendered. When closely studied, the entire verse seems to be but one sentence, and cannot be easily divided into two proportionate hemistiches. To remedy this apparent defect some translators have included in the second hemistich the word *snare*, *trap;* and render, "his nose pierceth through snares."

Albert Barnes has, "When taken in snares, who can pierce his nose?" The late Revised Version of Oxford has rendered the whole thus: "Shall any one take him when he is on the watch, or pierce through his nose with a snare?" As you will notice, in order to make sense out of this passage, they have been force to give it an interrogative turn, and to introduce at the same time the possessive pronoun, *his* (his nose), whilst it does not occur in the original. If we

accept the remaining words of this verse (יִנָּקֵב־אָף׃) in the form they stand, it is hard to make any sense out of them.

According to their generally accepted meaning we would have, literally, "He will hollow out, or perforate, or pierce through a nose." But another difficulty arises here, which gives us reasons to doubt of the correctness of the present form of the word (יִנָּקֵב) *yinkav*. It is not the regular form of the fut. of (נָקַב) *nakav*; it should be (יִקֹּב) *yikkov*. Moveover, from the intimate relation of this last word to the preceding one, as indicated by the hyphen, in the Hebrew, the order of the words should not be reversed so as to read, "*his* nose pierceth through," as many have rendered. I am of the opinion that, originally, the present word (יִנָּקֵב) *yinekav*, read (וְנָקֵב) *ounekev*, meaning *and a pipe*, or something *perforated*, *hollowed out*.

The entire expression would then mean—*and a pipe-nose;* or, *and a hollowed out nose*. I consider that the reference here is to a *perforated nozzle*.

It seems quite evident to me that the reading which I have proposed in this case was the original one, and that the whole trouble is due to the error of some scribe, or most probably to the difficulty of distinguishing, in an old and obliterated manuscript, between the slight difference there is between a *yodh*, and a *vave*.

Then again, under such circumstances, the difficulty of understanding what could be meant by

a hollowed out nose, might have had some influence in determining the copyist in his choice.

I consider that this hollow or perforated nozzle, or nose, is nothing less than what is called the suction-basket, or perforated brass tube coupled on to the end of the suction hose, or pipes, of our steam pumping engines. Some of these nozzles resemble much, indeed, in their appearance, as well as in their noisy gurgling action in sucking up the water, the snout of some aquatic monster who is quenching his thirst.

According to the above, this remarkable and difficult verse would now read: "He will gather it up (the water) in his fountains, by means of traps (valves), and *with* a perforated nozzle."

As novel and extraordinary as are the disclosures of the above rendering, yet I am satisfied that the reader will find in it none of the objectionable features which are so prominent in the various versions which have been proposed up to the present day.

It agrees perfectly with the meaning and reference which I have shown the previous verses to have. It is strictly literal, and needs neither the addition nor the transposition of a single word to render it perfectly intelligible.

Neither have I found it necessary to resort to the supposition of Bochart, and others, that this verse should be read interrogatively; by this means they give it a tone of denial in order to make it agree with their views. Then again the evident reference of this verse to the construction

of the pump of the steam draining machine, so clearly alluded to in the previous verse, has enabled us to detect an evident clerical error in the original text, as explained in the previous page.

According to the views of all those who have preceded me in the difficult task of unravelling this great mystery, this verse would end the description of the behemoth, taken as referring to some wild animal.

But, as I have already stated, the behemoth, viewed as our modern fiery monster, discloses the astonishing fact that he is a twin brother of the leviathan and of the same fiery nature, only that he is deprived of the use of limbs and caused to be stationary; whilst his brother, the leviathan can propel himself, and is known for his great speed on sea and on land. Both are endowed with the same peculiar power and strength. Indeed they are masterpieces of strength and beauty, and kings over all conceptions of power. (xl. 19; xli. 34.)

LEVIATHAN.

WHEN MADE TO PULL, HE IS COUPLED WITH A LINK.

Chapter xli. v. 1.

תִּמְשֹׁךְ	Thou wilt extend, lengthen out,	An extrahere poteris
לִוְיָתָן	leviathan	leviathan
בְּחַכָּה	with a hook	hamo,
וּבְחֶבֶל	or with a snare, noose, which	et fune
תַּשְׁקִיעַ	thou shalt cause to press down,	ligabis
לְשֹׁנוֹ׃	his tongue.	linguam ejus?

"Canst thou draw out leviathan with an hook? or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down?"

GENERALLY this verse is made the beginning of a new chapter. The reason for this seems to have been the supposition that the word *leviathan*, which occurs in this verse, referred to some animal entirely different from the behemoth; for such is the universal opinion of commentators up to the present day. As I have already stated in the previous chapter, I hope to be able to establish conclusively, from the separate meaning and application of each verse, as well as from the concordance of both chapters, that the so-called *behemoth* and *leviathan* are the one and the same power, described under its two main fea-

tures, viz., the stationary steam engine, and the self-propelling steam engine, the latter including the marine engine.

In the original manuscripts this description was not divided into two parts. The division of the Bible into chapters and verses, as is well known, is the work of a much later hand. Even at the present day the above verse, in the Hebrew editions, is numbered the twenty-fifth of the fortieth chapter.

The chief difficulty in this verse, and the one which, undoubtedly, caused it to be misunderstood and wrongly applied, is the word *leviathan.*

It is not a proper noun, nor the name of any animal known to the present day. It has puzzled the most learned scholars, and the best they could do, after pages of comment, was to leave the original word as they found it, and incorporate it whole into their various translations. The Septuagint, however, render it by the word *dragon*, which I find to be far more appropriate, as it means, in almost every language, *a fiery monster*, *a fiery flying serpent.* Up to the present day such a monster has been considered fabulous. But just at this moment, and under the light of the present discovery, it becomes somewhat interesting to know where the ancients could have obtained their idea of a monster so much resembling one which has but recently made its appearance in our midst. Indeed, our steam engine is a veritable *fiery monster*, and our lightning trains and locomotives real *fiery-flying serpents.*

Might not the idea of these so-called *fabulous* monsters have been derived from visions and prophecies dating back to the origin of mankind, yet referring to things of our days? Might it not have been derived from this vision of Job?

To say the least, it is very significant to find the wise Septuagint designating this leviathan as *the dragon*, or *fiery monster* of ancient tradition. Undoubtedly, had these learned men known or ever heard of an animal called *leviathan*, they would have retained the name.

In reference to this *leviathan* Adam Clarke says: "We come now to a subject not less perplexing than that one which we have just passed, and a subject on which learned men are less agreed than on the preceding."

Albert Barnes's opinion is, that "the whole description here is of an animal that lived in the water;" and adds: "Much has been written respecting this animal, and the opinions which have been entertained have been very various."

Schultens enumerates the following classes of opinions in regard to the animal intended here:

1. The opinion that the word *leviathan* is to be retained, without attempting to explain it—implying that there was uncertainty as to the meaning. Under this head he refers to the Chaldee and the Vulgate, to Aquila and Symmachus, where the word is retained, and to the Septuagint, where the word (δρακοντα) *dragon* is used, and also to the Syriac and Arabic, where the same word occurs.

2. The fable of the Jews, who mention a serpent so large that it encompassed the whole earth. A belief of the existence of such a marine serpent or monster still prevails among the Nestorians.

3. The opinion that the whale is intended.

4. The opinion that a large fish called *mular* or *musar*, which is found in the Mediterranean, is denoted. This is the opinion of Grotius.

5. The opinion that the crocodile of the Nile is denoted.

Others have understood the whole description as allegorical, representing monsters of iniquity; and among these, some have regarded it as descriptive of the devil! Bochart comes to the conclusion that the crocodile of the Nile is denoted; and in this opinion critics have generally, since his time, acquiesced.

Prof. Lee is of the opinion that in this place the description rather suits the *whale*, and more particularly one of the dolphin tribe; although he believes that a *sea-monster* is the one generally alluded to by the sacred writer.

Such are the views of some of our most learned writers concerning the nature of the animal supposed to be referred to under the name of *leviathan*. Yet, strange to say, none seem to have been able to point out to us that any such animals were ever called *leviathan*, by any ancient or modern writer. We are, therefore, left in doubt, up to this day, as to the true meaning and reference of the word.

After many tedious researches, I have come to

the conclusion that, the solution of this problem lies indicated in the word itself, and that it is intended to denote, not so much the name which this monster may bear, as some of its most prominent peculiarities. Such we have already found to be the case with the word *be-chemoth*, the etymology of this word agreeing perfectly with the subsequent description of this monster full of raging flames and internal commotions. It was designedly left to be found out, in after centuries, to what it referred. I now presume it to have been thus intended with the much-sought-for meaning of the word *leviathan*.

This word is evidently a compound one, composed of (לֵוִי) *levi*, from the root (לָוָה) *lavah*, *to fold*, *to wreath*, *to join one's self to another*; and (תָּן) *tan*, from the root (תָּנַן) *tanan*, meaning *to stretch out*, *to extend*; hence (תָּן) *tan*, *jackal*, so-called from its swift running, extending itself; hence also (תַּנִּין) *tannin*, supposed to be *a great serpent*, *a sea-monster*, so called from its supposed length; in reality, none other than this same monster of Job. The ending (ִן) *an*, may also be taken as an adjective, denoting of what a thing is made. In this case it would mean, one made up of folds, or made up of parts linked together, joined the one to the other.

From this we may safely conclude that the monster referred to here, must have had the appearance of an enormous serpent, stretched out, exceedingly long; and formed, as it were, of various large folds or parts, all joined or linked

the one to the other. Most exegetists have conceded this, but could find nothing better to suit it, and the context, than the crocodile; a creature which must be acknowledged to be too insignificant to bear such a name, and too loathsome to deserve such praise as we will find here bestowed upon the leviathan.

In connection with the above meaning of the roots of the word *leviathan*, I would call the attention of the reader to some further observations on the root (תָּנַן) *tanan*. We have seen that it indicates something that is *stretched out*, *extended;* and, by trope, something that runs swiftly. According to the Syriac and Chaldee it may be understood also of something that smokes, something similar to an oven or furnace. Now, if I be permitted to unite all these various meanings of the word, they would represent a monster made up of parts or folds linked the one to the other, or extending out like an enormous serpent, running swiftly, or smoking like an oven.

Have we anything in our days, which might answer these singular meanings of this word, and also suit the context?

I unhesitatingly answer—Yes; and that it is our modern train of coaches and locomotive. Indeed it is formed of various parts or folds, called coaches or cars. They are all *joined* or *linked* the one to the other, forming *a long extended body*, which when viewed from a distance, much resembles *a huge serpent-like monster* as it glides rapidly and tortuously through the forests and

the valleys of the mountains. It *runs swiftly*, and a volume of *smoke*, as from a huge furnace, pours forth from its throat.

In a word, it fulfills each and every meaning of which our most learned scholars have found the word *leviathan* to be susceptible.

If then, this supposed new monster, *leviathan*, be our self-propelling steam locomotive, and if my interpretation of behemoth be the true one, then these two monsters must be found to be identical in their nature, and in many of their essential parts; for, the stationary steam engine and boiler does not differ much, in its essential characteristics, from the locomotive or self-propelling steam engines.

Now, if we peruse for a moment this description of the leviathan, we find him represented to be as powerful and as invulnerable as his predecessor, behemoth. He also (leviathan) is constructed of iron, as we will find indicated by the nature of his shields, or the plates covering his body, which are said to be *welded* or *hammered* together He also is full of raging flames and coals of fire. The motive power of each is plainly indicated to be in the centre of his belly. Finally, most writers consider that both behemoth and leviathan were amphibious monsters, which is indeed the case with our modern monster of power for he perambulates with as much ease through the sea as he does over the land.

Another strong point in favor of the oneness of the main features of these monsters, is the

fact that, none of the described parts or attributes of the one, are shown to differ from the same parts in the other. For instance, neither the limbs, nor the tail, nor the body, nor the food, nor the eyes of the one are shown to differ from those of the other. Surely, the contrary of this would be expected, were two monsters of different species being separately described.

The leviathan of Job was, undoubtedly, an amphibious monster; and so is our modern, self-propelling, fiery monster. As a *tug-boat* he certainly fulfills also the various meanings which we have seen the word to have.

He is made fast to a long train of barges, each barge made fast to the other, forming, as it were, *a long extended body* moving around the bend and curves of the stream like a huge serpent.

As a steamship, we will find him fulfilling also all the requirements of the sea monster of Job, as described in the latter part of this chapter, and in many other parts of the Bible.

According to all the versions which I have seen, the verse under consideration is made to appear as though the present Hebrew text read in the interogative, which is certainly not the case. This, in itself, will be found to be a serious question, since it gives to the words of Job a meaning directly opposed to that which they really have.

There is certainly no good reason nor authority for the assumption that such was the meaning intended. Evidently, nothing ever suggested the

idea that this passage should be given a negative tone, beyond the apparent difficulty of making its meaning agree with that of subsequent passages; this difficulty arising from the now evident fact, at least to me, that this whole description has been wrongly applied. Therefore, instead of rendering this passage: "Canst thou draw out leviathan with an hook?" We should read: "Thou wilt draw out leviathan by means of a hook, etc." This naturally seems to contradict the repeated assertions, made in various parts of this description, that this monster could not be captured by such means, not even by harpoons or spears.

Consequently the supposition that this verse was originally intended to have a tone of denial, which was readily imparted to it by giving it the force of an interrogation—Canst thou draw?

I consider that the expression *to draw out*, is to be understood here in the sense of *to extend*, *to lengthen out*.

We find that the word is used in this sense in Isa. xviii. 2, 7, גּוֹי מְמֻשָׁךְ—*a people drawn out*, extended. So Gesenius, in lexicon.

The correctness of this view seems to be confirmed by the subsequent description of the manner in which this is to be accomplished; viz., by means of a hook, or by means of a snare or gin, which his tongue will cause to drop, or press down. We will see, directly, to what this tongue and snare refer.

According to the above, the original would

mean: "Thou wilt extend leviathan by means of a hook, or by means of a snare which thou wilt cause his tongue to press down (or to drop, to sink.)"

We have seen that one of the meanings of the word *leviathan* is, *one extended, drawn out.* Here, then, would be described the very means by which this monster is made to extend, or lengthen out.

Any one who is in the least acquainted with our locomotives, will at once recognize, in the above, a most perfect description of the manner in which the engine is made fast to cars and coaches in order to draw or pull them along, and forming, by this very means, a lengthening out or extension, as it were, of his body, thus assuming the appearance of a monster snake.

In many instances our primitive locomotives and coaches were made fast to one another by veritable *hooks.* Even our latest improvements in coupling cars consist of strong and thick bars of iron having a notch at the end, somewhat similar to a hook, by means of which the one holds fast to the other. But this is not all; our great Seer most minutely describes here the well-known process of coupling cars by means of a link and pin. He describes the combination of a hollow drawhead and pin as, *a snare* or *ketch*, which the tongue is made to *press down*, or cause to *drop.*

Undoubtedly, this *tongue* is the iron link which protrudes from the open mouth of one of the

drawheads; and, from this very circumstance, is here poetically called, *his tongue;* the iron pin being that part of the *snare* which is *pressed down* by this tongue, or link.

When two cars are brought together, the protruding link in the draw-head of the one, enters the opening of that of the other, causing thereby the heavy iron pin to drop. As it does so, it passes through the link and makes it fast. Could anything be found to fulfill so completely the words of this passage?

Who can understand how Job could have seen and examined, so minutely, such minor details as those of coupling cars, three thousand years before railroads came into existence on *this* globe? I dare say that many who do not believe in Job, nor in the Lord who then spoke to him, would be at a loss to give us as minute and perfect a description of our methods of coupling cars, although they live within sight of the great leviathan.

Let us now examine into the claims which some known animals might have to the well-defined characteristics of this leviathan. As to the elephant being referred to here under the name of leviathan, all will agree that the claim is untenable, as this so-called leviathan is evidently amphibious, and one that can move with great rapidity both on sea and land; whilst the contrary is the predominant characteristic of the elephant.

Many eminent writers have labored much to

prove that the crocodile is here referred to. But how could his well-known peculiarities be reconciled with the strange and extraordinary things related of the leviathan.

In the first place, according to this verse, this monster must have a tongue which can be made to protrude sufficiently to be caught in some sort of a snare, which will press through this tongue and hold it fast. Now it is well known that the crocodile has no such tongue.

On this passage Prof. Lee remarks: "Bochart finds a real difficulty here, because writers are unanimous in declaring that the crocodile has no such tongue as can be thus dealt with; but that the tongue he has is made fast to his lower jaw."

It is also worthy of notice that, no ancient or modern naturalist, ever pointed out the crocodile —or any other animal— as being the leviathan. The crocodile was always called a crocodile by all historians. Neither have we an instance in which the Lord makes mention of an animal by any other name than that which was conventional among the people He addressed. Had the Lord here referred to a crocodile, undoubtedly He would have called him by his well-known name, the same as he did when He spoke of the horse, the ostrich and other animals to which He refers in previous verses of this same book. It would not necessarily follow from this that, if the Lord had here intended to refer to our modern steam engine, He would have called it by the name which we have, but recently, given it. For, in such an in-

stance as this, He would not have been referring to an *animal*, nor to anything which then existed and had a name already well known in those days.

Then, the name *steam engine*, or, *locomotive*, would have been as much of a mystery to the people of those days (if not more), than the name of *leviathan*, which, as I have shown, has, in reality, the same characteristic meaning, viz.; a monster having a long extended body, formed of various parts linked together. We will see in Psl. lxxiv. 14, that the Lord is said to give food to the leviathan for those who inhabit desert places. Surely this could not apply to the crocodile; yet it does, most strikingly, to our railroads.

It is said of the leviathan (ch. xli. 21) that "his inhaling vivifieth coals of fire, and a flame goeth out of his mouth." Nothing of the kind can be attributed to the breath of any animal, and much less to that of a sleepy and slimy crocodile. A creature's breath was never known to possess the capacity of kindling coals of fire. But the inhaling of the steam engine—the draft of air—does vivify the coals of fire, and a flame does, very often, leap forth from its throat.

Again it is evident that neither the crocodile, nor any other animal, can be made to extend, or lengthen out, in the peculiar manner indicated in this first verse of Job, viz.: by a hook or by means of a snare that entraps his tongue. Yet all this is very natural to our modern leviathan.

As to the hippopotamus, his friends abandon

him here, as he is not found to possess the peculiar powers nor the great qualities ascribed to this monster.

To those who suppose that a whale may be here referred to, I would say that it seems less probable than either of the former. There is nothing in a whale's breath that can *kindle coals of fire*. Neither has it anything in the shape of *scales* or *flakes* which can at all compare with those which are said to cover the body of the leviathan. Whales surely do not "laugh at the shaking of a spear." And their eyes are far from being "like the eyelids of the morning" (chap. xli. 18, 29).

I presume that the reader is aware that we have had two enormous monsters of immense power, which have born the very name of *leviathan*, and which have possessed, to the very letter, their respective share of the attributes which Job claims for his leviathan.

One of these was the Great Eastern, which at first bore the name of Leviathan. The other, one of the most powerful locomotives ever built for our southern roads. Thus, in reality, I am referring to monsters already well known among us by the name of *Leviathan;* which is more than commentators have been able to show in support of their views.

This singular and extraordinary verse has now an interesting signification for us, as we have good reasons for supposing that Job referred to our modern fiery flying monster when he said:

"Thou wilt extend leviathan with a hook, or with a snare which thou wilt cause his tongue to press down."

We will notice throughout this description that the name *leviathan* is applied, either to a long train of coaches and locomotive—as in this instance—or to the locomotive by itself; or to a steamboat; the context alone pointing out in what capacity he is being considered, or what parts are being described.

HIS CHEEKS WILL BE PERFORATED WITH A STAFF.

Verse 2.

הֲתָשִׂים	Wilt thou place	Numquid pones
אַגְמֹן	a ring, caldron, cord	circulum
בְּאַפּוֹ	in his nose,	in naribus ejus,
וּבְחוֹחַ	or with a hook, staff	aut armilla
תִּקֹּב	wilt thou pierce through	perforabis
לֶחְיוֹ	his cheeks?	maxillam ejus?

"Canst thou put a hook in his nose? Or bore his jaw through with a thorn?"

To those who look upon this description as referring to some ferocious wild monster, this verse does not present any great difficulties, on account of the various meanings which may be attributed to some of its words. From my point of view of its reference, I am only puzzled as to a choice between the many and appropriate applications which I find these same words to have.

If the interrogative tone of this verse is to be considered as equivalent to a denial, then our translations would lead us to understand that it would be impossible to put a hook or a ring through this monster's nose, as is often done with unruly beasts; or that it would be frivolous to

attempt to put a thorn through his jaws or gills, as is commonly practiced with small fishes.

If this were the only meaning of the original, then it could not refer to a locomotive, for a ring or a hook can be, and is often, attached to many parts of the locomotive, especially at its very nose. Then, again, it would be hard to understand in what sense it could be said that its *jaws* or *gills* could not be bored through with a thorn; for it could not be properly predicated of a locomotive, nor of a steamship, for neither of them have anything like jaws or gills.

The word *agemon* may mean *a ring*, *caldron* or *a boiling kettle*, *a reed*, *a rope* or *a cord* made of reeds or rushes. The word rendered *thorn*, also means *a hook* or *a staff*, or *a ring*. Some suppose that by *hook*, is here meant *a bit*, or *curved iron*. The word rendered *jaws*, has also the meaning of *cheeks;* some render *gills*. Now if the original words of this verse were ever intended to have a negative sense, I would prefer rendering thus: "Wilt thou place a rope-halter over its nose? or force a bit through its jaws?" In this sense it would mean that this monster could not be stopped or held with a halter made of mere reeds or rushes; nor could he be guided by means of a bit and curb, as domestic animals are.

In its application to our powerful and iron-headed monster, this would be eminently ironical; for who would think of trying to hold him with a rope which he held in his hands, or of

trying to guide him with a bit and bridle, like a horse.

In order to strengthen their views, many writers have gone to great length to inform us how the hippopotamus and the crocodile are caught. But all their arguments fall to the ground when one seriously considers the meaning and reference they attribute to this verse themselves; for they assure us that it is here meant that this monster must be one through whose nose we cannot put a ring or a cord to hold him; nor even can we cause a hook to penetrate his jaws.

Now the fact is that all this can be easily practiced with either the hippopotamus or the crocodile, the very one which they wish us to accept as this leviathan. The crocodile, specially, is often caught with baited hooks, as almost any such monsters can be. But would it not be ridiculous and absurd to try to capture a locomotive or a steamship with a baited hook, be the bait ever so tempting, and the hook ever so sharp? Then, where is the one who would hold the line, if he were caught? Thus, in this sense, this passage has a far more probable and poetic application to our unruly monster, than to a comparatively insignificant crocodile.

I believe that it is on record that some wild Indian tribes, wishing to assert their exclusive rights to some western territory, through which a railroad passed, decided to capture this fiery monster by lassoing him. Mounting their best ponies they laid in wait along the road. It was

not long before they got an opportunity to try their skill. Indeed a brave succeeded in fastening his lasso to some part of the locomotive. But imagine the result. His pony, to which was made fast one end of the rope, acquired, all at once, a speed which he had never developed before, and which he never equaled afterwards. His prodigious bounces through the prairie soon unsaddled his master who was but too glad to be able to join his brave warriors in their precipitate flight to their distant huts. They never wanted to try again "to put a halter over his nose."

Indeed, it is only in comparing the behemoth and leviathan to our terrible engine of power, that we can fully realize the beauty and poetry of Job's description.

Although, in the above light, this verse would apply remarkably well to our locomotive, yet I am not satisfied that it is the meaning intended here. Neither can I look upon it as having an exclusively negative character; but rather an affirmative force, equivalent to a negative question, as "Wilt thou *not* place a ring in his nostrils?" Neither can I see any good reason for supposing, as some do, that the leviathan is being considered here as a sea monster. This idea can only be inferred from the renderings of those who suppose that such a creature was here meant; but not from any direct assertion of the original words, nor from those of the previous or subsequent verses. In fact the latter, when properly understood, clearly establish the contrary.

We have seen, in the previous verse, that the Lord began the description of the leviathan by calling Job's attention to the fact that this monster had a body that was capable of being extended and lengthened out. He shows him that this body was formed of various parts all linked and coupled the one to the other, as the very name He gave him, indicated. Even the manner of coupling these various parts is most minutely described. All of which has been shown to refer, most conclusively, to a locomotive and train of coaches. Should we not now expect, as a most natural continuation of this subject, that, before asking Job whether he could put a hook in his nose, He would explain to him some other peculiarities of this singular creature, such, for instance, as his fierce and dangerous nature? For, were he tame, this would not be a dangerous undertaking.

It is this idea which leads me to believe that, if this verse were properly understood, we would be apt to find in it a reference to some other natural and striking peculiarities of this coupled dragon. It is evident that his nose and cheeks are here spoken of; but so far it has been difficult to ascertain in what connection.

To me the word *agemon*, would seem to contain the solution of the problem. Its primary meaning is *a boiling caldron*. This is one of the essential parts of our own monster. Then we will see that this word is made use of in this sense in the twentieth verse of this same chap-

ter, where it is said of this monster, "out of his nostrils will issue forth smoke, as out of *a boiling pot or caldron*."

Taking the word in this sense, and the verse as having the force of a negative question, we would have this singular revelation, viz.: "Wilt thou *not* place a boiling caldron in his nose?"

Referring to the locomotive, we are astonished to discover how well the word *nose* applies to that elongated part of the boiler which extends to the front of the engine. And when we examine closely into the nature of this nose, we find, indeed, that some one *has placed a boiling caldron* in it; in fact that his nose *is* a boiling caldron. This discovery must have been as great a surprise to the good man Job as the unexpected revelations of this verse will, undoubtedly, be to the reader.

The same words of this passage disclose also another very appropriate meaning; it is that which is also given to them by the Septuagint and the Vulgate, and which I believe to be the true one, viz., "Wilt thou place a ring in his nostrils?"

The nostrils of an animal are the organs through which he breathes. Now if we examine our engine closely, we will find on each side of his head, or rather on each side of his huge nose-shaped boiler, two large cylinders, resembling much, indeed, from their position and functions, the nostrils of an animal. To these are connected the steam-chests. Upon further investigation we

find that it is through these double sets of organs that he emits, alternately, his vaporous breath (steam), just as an animal does in forcing his breath from his chest through his nostrils. So that these cylinders and their steam-chests resemble, indeed, in purpose and action, the nostrils and the chest of a living monster. Therefore the propriety, in the highly poetical style of this description, in speaking of these mechanical organs as the nostrils of this monster.

A further observation reveals to us the fact that, inside of these mechanical nostrils is a large circular plate of iron, called a piston. Around the periphery of this piston is one or more expansive and self-adjusting rings, serving to form an air-tight, yet movable, partition inside each cylinder. And this, I conclude, is the *ring* which is mentioned in this verse as being *placed in his nostrils*. It is possible that the original word is intended to refer to the very piston itself, as it is mainly a ring. Here, then, we have a good opportunity of judging of the perfect knowledge which the revealer of this description possessed of the construction of the most important parts of the engine.

As to the second member of this verse, we find, as I have already mentioned, that the word (חוח) *chocha* means, primarily, *a ring*, then *a hook*, *a thorn*. I consider that the word is here intended in the sense of *a crook*, or shepherd's staff; that is, that it was something which resembled, in shape, a long staff, and terminated at one end

with a ring or hook. Any hook, says Webster, is a crook. The word (לֶחִי) *lechi* means, primarily, *the cheek;* and it is in this sense I take it here. As the verb which occurs here means *to pierce through*, we would have, as the meaning of this verse, "Wilt thou *not* place a ring in his nostrils, or pierce through his cheeks with a staff?"

We have just seen, in the first part of this verse, that the piston and its packing-rings were referred to. Now, to the centre of this piston we will find that there is made fast a long and smooth iron rod, which passes through one end of the cylinder, and terminates at its exterior end with a suitable connection, answering the purpose of a hook or ring, and by which it is made fast to other parts of the machinery. In this piston-rod I recognize the very instrument mentioned in this passage as a staff, and which is said to perforate, or pierce through, the cheeks of the leviathan. If this be it, then *the cheeks*, here alluded to, must be the round and convex heads of the cylinders through which this rod passes; and by its rapid and continuous in-and-out motion, seems, indeed, as though it were perforating or piercing through these cheeks. Hence, also, the very appropriate and poetical application of these words of Job.

We have here, then, revealed to us the piston and its packing-rings; the cylinders and their perforated heads; and the piston-rod with its perforated knob at the end, which gives it the appearance of a staff, to which it is here likened.

HIS VOICE IS IMPERATIVE AND TERRIBLE.

Verse 3

הֲיַרְבֶּה	Will he multiply	Numquid multi-
אֵלֶיךָ	unto thee	plicabit ad te
תַּחֲנוּנִים	supplications,	preces,
אִם־יְדַבֵּר	or will he utter (speak)	aut loquetur
אֵלֶיךָ	unto thee	tibi
רַכּוֹת׃	soft tones?	mollia?

"Will he make many supplications unto thee? Will he speak soft words unto thee?"

All versions seem to agree in their translations of this verse. But many expositors vary in their application of its meaning.

Barnes says: "The idea is that the animal here referred to would not tamely submit to his captor, nor plead for his life in tones of tender and plaintive supplication."

In reference to this view of it, I would say that there is nothing mentioned in this verse, nor in any other, that would go to prove that this monster was ever captured. On the contrary, he is represented everywhere as unconquerable and invulnerable. We have just seen that, in one sense of the passage, one cannot put a halter

over his nose, nor fasten anything to his jaw. Subsequent passages, as you will notice, are still more emphatic in this declaration. We read in the ninth and tenth verses of the present chapter that "one shall be cast down even at the sight of him;" and that "none is so brave that dare stir him up."

The opinion of Prof. Lee is that the dolphinus orca communis, or common grampus, is the animal more particularly had in view, and that allusion is here made to the well-know cries of this animal when captured. Here, again, I would insist that no such inference can be drawn from the passage before us. The dolphin, according to Prof. Lee's own account, cries and carries on *most piteously* when he or his mate *is captured.* These are surely *soft* and *pleading* tones, whilst the interrogative character of this verse indicates that exactly the contrary will be the case with the leviathan; he will not use many supplications toward thee, nor will his utterances be soft or plaintive. Moreover, the dolphin can be, and is, caught by hooks and cords, whilst we are told that the leviathan cannot be taken by such means.

Adam Clarke, recognizing the difficulty there was in applying the full force of these passages to any known animal, prudently remarks that there are several allusions in these verses to matters of which one could know but very little.

It seems to me that the most natural and only inference to be drawn, both from the negative

character of this verse and from the words themselves, is that this monster will not often repeat his warnings or supplications, nor will he make use of soft tones in doing so; in other words, his warnings will be few and uttered in terrific tones. These cannot be taken in any other sense than warnings of danger to those who would not heed his presence or his approach. Isaiah informs us (chap. xxvii. 1) that this leviathan was a "swift-fleeing serpent, turning himself rapidly, and continually in motion." Undoubtedly it is from these facts that this monster has neither time nor disposition to stop and argue with you to please get out of his way; a few terrific utterances is all the warning you will get; then, woe to him who does not heed them. And, from this, what could one surmise would happen? Why, evidently that this fiery monster, in his precipitate flight from one place to another, would crush and trample under him all that did not get out of his way after a few sharp and terrific warnings.

And how would this beautiful passage agree with the well-known peculiarities of our steaming monster, the locomotive, and its terrific powers of utterance made specially to give warnings of his approach? When he is at full rage on his way, does he stop to make many supplications to you *to please* get out of his path? A terrific and imperative blast of his breath is the only warning he gives, as he rushes on with lightning speed, crushing and tearing to pieces those

who have not heeded his voice. He is a heartless monster, with iron ribs and flanks. His blood is a boiling steam; his food, coals of fire. His breath of life, a devouring flame. His eye, a stream of light. His mane, thick clouds of smoke and sparks of fire. The earth and the sea tremble at his approach, and the very heavens murmur at the terrific utterance of his voice. From before him flee in dismay the wild beasts of the forests. Yea, the hippopotamus and the crocodile are terrified at his presence and hasten away as he boldly invades their ancient domains and chases them from their marshy lairs in the midst of the reeds and fens.

Behold, our leviathan looks upon all these monsters as small birds. Indeed he often carries them about in a cage for the pleasure of the children on his way. He fills his coils with the largest of them with as much ease and indifference as a huge serpent when feeding on the small lizards and frogs of a pond.

My conclusion is obvious. None of the monsters proposed up to this day can ever fulfill, as completely, the requisites of this and other passages of this sublime description, as our modern monster of power.

Stand before him and see if he will stop to make repeated supplications unto thee, in soft and pleading tones.

HE IS TREACHEROUS AND NOT TO BE RELIED ON.

Verse 4.

הֵיכָרֹת	Will he make	Nunquid feriet
בְּרִית	a covenant (agreement)	pactum
עִמָּךְ	with thee	tecum,
תִּקָּחֶנּוּ	that thou mayest take him	et accipies eum
לְעֶבֶד	for a servant	servum
עוֹלָם׃	for ever, or, everlasting?	sempiternum?

"Will he make a covenant with thee? Wilt thou take him for a servant forever?"

The true reference of the above verse could not have been understood by those writers who believed that a whale or a crocodile was here meant.

Barnes and others suppose this verse to mean that the animal referred to could not be reduced to service, that is, could not be tamed or rendered reliable, or reduced to domestic use, such for instance as the crocodile and the hippopotamus. As to the latter, it is a well-known fact that, if taken when young, it can be tamed and rendered quite docile, as has been repeatedly noticed in our travelling menageries, although he

cannot be made very serviceable for domestic purposes.

But let us examine more closely into the construction of this verse and see if it be not possible to render its meaning somewhat more intelligible, for there seems to me to be a discrepancy somewhere.

The question as it stands, "Will he make a covenant with thee?" cannot be considered as adding to or detracting from his power. If it means anything it is that he is capable of making a covenant. And, surely, it could not be supposed that *he* could, any more than other monsters of the same nature. Then, again, one is at a loss to know what kind of a covenant can be meant.

To explain these difficulties and to make sense of this first hemistich, I find that it is necessary to connect it closely with the second, instead of dividing it as usual. Thus, the agreement or convenant with this monster seems incapable of making or keeping, would refer to the binding of himself as a trustworthy servant at all times.

In writing the two hemistiches of this verse into one sentence, we would have the following: "Will he make a covenant with thee that thou mayest take him for a servant forever?" Thus the whole verse becomes quite intelligible, and at once we can clearly see that this covenant refers to the possibility or impossibility of so binding this monster that he should become a trustworthy servant at all times, or, forever.

Taking this passage in its negative sense, it

evidently means that this monster will not bind himself (or, that one cannot bind him) to serve him faithfully forever.

It must also be inferred from this, that this leviathan is of a dangerous and treacherous nature, that he cannot be relied on at all times as a faithful servant. From this very fact arises, undoubtedly, the impossibility of his making a *covenant to serve faithfully forever*. Then again it clearly indicates that he will be made a servant of, but not such that he can be relied on at all times. If he could not be made a servant of *at all*, why should it be said that he cannot be taken for a servant *forever*, *continually;* for the latter certainly implies that he could be taken for a servant for *a time*, but not *forever*. What a mysterious creature. No wonder that he has remained so long unknown. Let us see if this verse also, could not apply to our powerful servant, the steam engine. It is well known that he cannot be trusted at all times, nor forever. He becomes very treacherous when the fireman excites him up to his full rage. At times, without the least warning, he will burst the strongest bonds and scatter death and devastation around him. He is indeed a most useful servant, but he must be continually watched. He cannot be trusted out of the hands of his keepers.

Because he has an iron constitution one must not suppose that he will make of him a servant everlasting, "servum sempiternum;" for in a short time the strength of his iron shields will weaken,

yet not so with his treacherous rage always increasing and always threatening to tear his flanks to pieces.

Job undoubtedly understood by visions, what we have learned by experience, viz., that this powerful servant, although seemingly indestructible, soon goes to destruction and sometimes in a terrible manner, and therefore is, indeed, neither a reliable servant nor one that can last forever.

Another very poetic idea may be inferred from the words of Job, viz., "Has he made a covenant with thee that thou shouldest bind him to serve continually, forever? Wilt thou not allow him to rest or to gambol and roam about at leisure for a while?" This, not altogether improbable meaning of this passage, would indicate the exact nature of our modern monster, who is often made to work night and day without rest, as though he had made an agreement to do so. Then, on account of his nature, he certainly cannot be allowed to skip or roam about at leisure; although we have, recently, heard of some *runaway* engines.

In all truth, then, can it be said of our modern leviathan that, although he is a very good servant, yet we cannot so *bind him*, either by *agreement* or by force, that he may be always, and at all times, a faithful and trustworthy servant.

HE CANNOT BE HANDLED AS A PLAYTHING.

Verse 5.

הֲתְשַׂחֵק־בּוֹ	Wilt thou play with him	Numquid illudes
כַּצִּפּוֹר	as a little bird.	ei quasi avi,
וְתִקְשְׁרֶנּוּ	or wilt thou bind him	aut ligabis eum
לִנְעָרוֹתֶיךָ׃	to thy maidens?	ancillis tuis?

"Wilt thou play with him as a bird? Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?"

It is easily seen that the interrogative tone of this verse is intended to be taken in a negative sense, implying that this leviathan cannot be handled carelessly as a plaything, nor entrusted to weak and unskilled hands.

The Septuagint add the word *sparrow*, in the second member of the verse, making it read: "Wilt thou bind him as a sparrow for a babe." I look upon the expression *to bind* as meaning here, first *to tame*, extending its reference to any animal which can be tamed to such an extent that it can be entrusted to children to play with.

Many dangerous creatures can be bound, although they cannot be made a safe plaything for children. Therefore I do not understand the above to mean that this powerful monster could not be bound at all; but rather that he could

not be tamed or placed sufficiently under control to be entrusted to children as a plaything. We have seen in the previous verse that he could be bound as a servant.

Secondly, this binding of him *for*, or *to*, the maidens, may be taken in the sense of harnessing him. as one would harness a gentle horse for children to sport with. Or as a plaything *made fast to* a child.

To bind horses to a chariot, is a well-known Biblical expression. In the thirty-third verse of the present chapter the Septuagint express the the idea that this leviathan was made to be sported with by the angels. Then certainly he would have to be bound in some way. By angels may be meant messengers of God here on earth. As the writer is describing the most terrible and most powerful monster on earth, one that is called the "king over all conceptions of power," as will be seen in the last verse, we can appreciate the poetry and irony of the question put to Job, whether he thought that such a monster could be played with, as a child would with a small bird; or if he could be safely harnessed for the sport of children.

The French version expresses here the very genius of the original, it has: "T'en jouras-tu comme d'un petit oiseau? et l'attacheras-tu pour tes jeunes filles?"

Barnes sees great force in the words of Job, on the supposition that the crocodile is intended.

"Nothing," says he, "could be more incongruous than the idea of securing so rough and un-

sightly a monster for the amusement of tender and delicate females."

Had the above learned author suspected that a full-fledged steam locomotive, weighing from sixty to seventy thousand pounds, and carrying within his flanks a most terribly explosive force, was intended, would he not have seen a *greater force* in the above question? And especially when the handling of intricate and ponderous machinery is included; which is a thing so peculiarly foreign to the inclination and capacity of females. Indeed, this verse can apply to no monster more dangerous or more untamable than our modern steam dragon which, at times, neither iron nor steel can hold. What a pretty bird one of our fiery locomotives would make for a cage; and then he utters such soft notes. I fear, indeed, that Job's maidens would not fancy him for a pet.

I have already expressed the opinion, at the beginning of this work, that the Lord does not, in this description, address himself exclusively to Job, but, through him, to all mankind; and this seems to be clearly established here, from the fact that Job had lost all his sons and daughters at the time the Lord thus addressed him, saying: "Wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?"

These words would then be intended in the sense of, "Will man bind him for his maidens?" Taken in this light, it does not become necessary to suppose, as some writers do, that this monster must have existed during the days of Job and in his immediate neighborhood.

SPECULATORS WILL FEAST UPON HIM.

Verse 6

יִכְרוּ	They will feast	Concident
עָלָיו	upon him	eum
חַבָּרִים	companies of friends, partners;	amici?
יְחַצְּוּהוּ	They will divide, or, share him,	divident
בֵּין	among	illum
כְּנַעֲנִים׃	speculators,—traders (Canaanites).	negotiatores?

"Shall thy companions make a banquet of him? Shall they part him among the merchants?"

THIS is considered one of the vexed passages, a veritable "pons asinorum." Yet this does not arise from any great difficulty in ascertaining the meaning of the original words, but rather from the difficulty which translators and commentators have had to battle against, in making these words agree with their own ideas. There have been various renderings and speculations concerning the true meaning of this verse, and no two seem to agree.

The Vulgate, the Septuagint and our English versions differ widely in their renderings. The Vulgate has: "Will friends carve him? Will merchants divide him?" The Septuagint have:

"Do the people feed upon him? Will the nations of the Phenicians share him?"

Several French translations render: "Des amis se régaleront ils de sa chair? Sera-t-il partagé entre les marchands?"

Prof. Lee has the following: "Will the companies bargain over him? Will they divide him among the merchants?"

He explains by saying that the Hebrew word meaning *to bargain* is often taken in the sense of *digging;* and as bargains were usually ratified by slaughtering and feasting upon animals—hiring, bargaining, and the like, have become part of its significations.

Umbreit has seized the idea of the original far better than the above; he renders it: "Do partners in trade purchase him? Is he divided among the Canaanites?"

He explains by saying that, although (כָּרָה) *karah*, is usually taken to signify feasting, yet it is here used with greater propriety to mean to *buy*, as in Deut. ii. 6; Hos. iii. 2, and that the expression *Canaanites* is here put for merchants in general.

Barnes, in explanation of this passage, says: "The word rendered *thy companions* means properly those joined or associated together for any purpose, whether for friendship or for business. It may refer here either to those associated for the purpose of fishing or feasting.

Further on the same writer says: "The majority of versions incline to the idea that it refers

to a feast, and means that those associated for eating do not make a part of their entertainment of him."

Is it not to be looked upon as very singular that, according to the above statement, the majority of versions entertain the idea that the monster referred to, could not be eaten? The original Hebrew does not convey, directly, this idea; but the interrogative turn given to it by most versions—and of which it is susceptible—leads us to understand that, in one sense, it could not be shared or divided among friends as a thing to be eaten; or so parted that it might be retailed out to customers.

From my views of the reference of this prophetic description, I am far from objecting to the above interpretations; for, indeed, my leviathan cannot be cut up and feasted upon by friends associated for a banquet; neither can butchers divide him for their customers; for his body is formed of iron plates welded together, and his bones are bars of iron. So that, in this sense, those who suppose that this monster could be carved out, or used for food, are very much mistaken.

Taking this leviathan as referring to a locomotive, one can appreciate the full force and poetry of the question, whether people would think that they could feast on such a monster, or divide and retail him among the merchants. Still I look upon this verse as having a far more extraordinary meaning hidden within it, and that it is its primary meaning.

In the first place the original does not read interrogatively, but in a plain affirmative tone.

Second. I consider, that the word rendered *companions*, *friends*, should be translated *partners*, *companies*.

Third. That the word rendered *to cut*, *to make a banquet*, *to feed upon*, etc., means here *to share*, *to divide*.

Fourth. That the name Canaanite is a well-known synonyme for *traders*, *speculators*, and should be so rendered.

By referring to the original Hebrew quoted at the beginning, you will notice that it does not read *thy* companions, but simply companions, or rather *partners*, *companies*. Neither is it there stated that merchants, or speculators, will divide him among themselves; but that the above-mentioned partners, or companies, will divide him among the merchants, or traders.

Therefore the primary meaning of this verse is, "Companies, (or partners) will feast upon him; they will divide (or share) him among the traders (speculators)."

How is this for our modern Railroad Companies; and our Railroad Stock Speculators? They feast on our great leviathan; yea, they grow fat on him, yet they do not eat him. Partners and circles of friends purchase him and *share him* out among traders and speculators, yet they do not cut him up. Are not these the very ideas claimed to be conveyed by the original, and which have so puzzled our learned exponents?

What a foresight! Over three thousand years ago, our railroad magnates and their partners, and our stock speculators, were seen feasting on the leviathan. It strikes me that this must be the fulfillment of the old traditional feast of the Jews. It was to occur in the latter days, when the children of Israel were to feast on the leviathan and share him among themselves. Decidedly, they form, this day, a majority of the Canaanites, here referred to. It would seem as though their old and incomprehensible tradition was now being visibly fulfilled before our eyes.

I cannot close this chapter without a few remarks on the peculiar rendering of the Septuagint. As you will notice, they were far from considering that the Lord here addressed his remarks to Job individually, or to his friends, but rather to men in general, or to nations at large. They render, "Do the people feast upon him?" and not, "Shall *thy* companions make a feast of him?" Their rendering of the second hemstich is as remarkable as the first. They say: "Will the nations of the Phenicians share him?"

It would seem from this that they understood, either by tradition or by some ancient manuscripts, that this creature of great power would be known among all nations, and not only by a few tribes that might inhabit a certain country where some such ferocious beast might be found. By "nations of the Phenicians," must here be meant not only the Phenicians of those days, but the trading nations in general. I would conclude

that the Septuagint understood, to a great extent, to what this description referred. Their renderings of other verses, which follow, most conclusively prove this.

I will leave to others the task of applying the plain original words of this verse to any animal, with as much force and truth as it applies to our modern steam engine, our railroad companies and speculators.

This beautiful and prophetic Hebrew verse deserves a prominent place in the palaces of our Railroad Companies, and specially in the escutcheon of our Railroad Magnates. And Job should have a monument in this great land of the leviathans and Canaanites.

In our days we can fully appreciate what Job meant when he said:

> "Companies will feast upon him;
> They will share him among speculators."

THE LEVIATHAN'S BODY IS FILLED WITH BOOTHS.

Verse 7.

הַתִּמַּלֵּא	Wilt thou *not* fill	Numquid implebis
בְּשֻׂכּוֹת	בְּסֻכּוֹת with booths	sagenas
עוֹרוֹ	his skin,	pelle ejus,
וּבְצִלְצָל	and with a cabin	et gurgustium
דָּגִים	דָּוָגִים of fishermen	piscium
רֹאשׁוֹ׃	his head?	capite illius?

"Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?
Or his head with fish-spears?"

I AM not astonished at the various and conflicting renderings we have of this verse. Indeed, I must say that, after having spent much time on it myself, and taken every conceivable view of it and of the various possible meanings of each word, I am forced to the conclusion that there is something wrong with our present Hebrew text. According to most of our English versions, it reads:

"Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?
Or his head with fish-spears?

As you will notice, it is not the *body* of this monster which seems to be here in question, nor his shields, but *his skin*. It would appear also as

though it were the intention of the writer to have us consider this as something separate from the main body, even as separate from the head, to which he refers afterwards. I could not agree to the supposition that here a part is put for the whole; for, in an exceptional case as this, there would be great danger of leading the reader into error. If the entire animal had been meant, the use of the word *body*, would have answered all purposes.

In reading over this verse, it occurs to me that, if the original had been intended to convey the idea that this monster was invulnerable, and that, consequently, not a single spear could be made to penetrate his body, that it would not be asked if his skin could be filled with them. Then, this would seem to imply that, although one might put two or three spears in his body, yet it could not be literally filled with them. There could be no sense in this; for if one spear, or harpoon, could be made to penetrate his shield, logically speaking, a great number could be made to do the same. Yet there is no doubt but that the original means "Canst thou fill his skin?" But with what? Some render the original word by *barbed irons*; *spears;* others by *arrows.* The Vulgate by *nets.* The Septuagint seem to think that it refers to a whole fleet of small vessels; and that it is the skin of this monster's tail that is here referred to. Undoubtedly the word (שְׂכוֹת) *souccoth*, rendered *spears*, has not a very intelligible meaning in the connection and in the form in which it now stands.

I am also puzzled to understand the reason why it should be asked, in the second hemstich, whether this monster's head could be equally filled, not with barbed irons or pointed irons, as the other part of his body, but with a different kind of instrument, rendered here *fish-spears*.

Can it be supposed that it was necessary and customary, in those days, to have two kinds of spears to kill such monsters. One to be used specially in penetrating the body, and the other to serve exclusively to penetrate the head? This is very doubtful. Although it may be claimed to be but a parallelism between the two members of this verse, yet I look upon the latter as being a forced rendering for the very purpose of making it appear as a parallel to the former; for there is no good authority for rendering (צְלָצַל) *tslatsal*, by *spears* or *harpoons*. Nowhere in the Bible has it been used in the sense of a weapon or instrument of destruction. Although, we may admit, some of the derivatives of (צָלַל) *tsalal*, have been used to denote certain musical instruments, such as cymbals, etc., from the fact that one of the roots of the word means *to tinkle*, *to ring;* denoting, in this instance, the very *nature* of a musical instrument, but not applicable to an instrument of destruction; the latter generally deriving its name from a root denoting, not only its nature but also some of its most prominent peculiarities as a weapon, such as that of being *sharp*, *pointed*, etc. I have never seen a fish-spear that might be said *to ring*, *to tinkle*. And I do

not believe that the rude instruments of primitive ages, generally made of flint, wood or rough pieces of metal, had much *ring* or *tinkle* to them. Moreover, as the word is in the singular number the proper rendering would be *a spear of fishes;* which, of itself condemns that interpretation of the word.

The Vulgate has, with far more propriety, rendered *cabin;* deriving this meaning from (צֵל) *tsel*, meaning *shade;* hence *a shelter*, *a cabin*. Yet who will explain to us the strange meaning of the Latin version of this passage? It has: "Wilt thou fill nets with his skin? and the cabin of fishes with his head?" From the negative tone given to this verse by its being in the interrogative, it must be inferred to mean, that it would be impossible to put his hide in fishermen's nets, or his head in a cabin made to keep fishes. But, again, what sense would there be in this? Did the ancients ever make it a practice to fill their nets with the skins of fishes? And was it customary with fishermen in those days to cut off the heads of the fishes they caught and put them (the heads) into cabins? Evidently the original words were never intended to be taken in this sense. Yet, it appears to me, from my point of view of the reference of this description, that the Vulgate's rendering contains valuable suggestions as to the proper meaning of this difficult passage, as I will explain hereafter. Commentators, in general, suppose that reference is had here to the thickness and impenetrability

of this monster's hide, which neither sharp-pointed irons nor spears could penetrate. But, this fact is asserted so often throughout this description, and in such various and unequivocal terms, that I cannot see the use nor the probability of its being referred to here in such a doubtful phraseology.

Might not some of the difficulty have been caused by changing the originally affirmative tone of this verse into the interrogative, giving it, thereby, a negative character which it should not have? This could have been skilfully accomplished by the simple addition of the present prefix (הַ) *he*, to the original fut. Kal (תִּמְלָא) *timla*, *thou wilt fill*. Thus, instead of "wilt thou fill?" it might have read originally "Thou wilt fill his skin with pointed irons (iron bolts), and his head with fish-spears." In this light, then, this passage would mean that, man *will fill* this monster's hide with pointed irons, or iron bolts.

Although this is exactly the contrary to what might be expected in reference to a terrible and invulnerable monster, yet, strange to say, it is exactly what occurs to our modern leviathan.

The numerous plates of iron or of steel, which really constitute its hide, or its exterior envelope, are filled with sharp-headed iron bolts. And, in one sense, it is really not its body, which is so filled, for it is hollow, but really its hide, *its skin*, as the Hebrew text has it.

As to the second part of this verse, which states that *his head* will be filled with fish-spears,

it might be supposed to be intended to refer to that apparently tremendous head of the locomotive, the smoke-stack, which, up to very recently with us, was very large at the top, and was, in many instances, ornamented with numerous thin metallic blades, really, in appearance and shape, like so many vibrating spear-heads. By examining that class of locomotives, one will readily notice the striking application of this view of the reference of this description.

The reason which might have prompted some ingenious writer to alter the meaning of this verse, in some primitive manuscript, might be this. It was naturally supposed that this entire description referred to some invulnerable monster, as it does most evidently. Consequently, it must have been a surprise to find here one verse which would pointedly contradict all the others, by asserting that his skin would be filled with pointed irons, and his head with fish spears.

Of course, the evident mistake (?) was promptly and, as it seems, ingeniously corrected.

Again, sometimes an interrogation may have an affirmative force, equivalent to a negative question as: "Canst thou not fill his skin . . . ?" This view would be preferable here. But, thanks to the presence of the leviathan himself, I hope we will be enabled to unravel also this deep mystery, which has worried so many.

The supposition, that this verse might have, originally, read in the affirmative, although it seems to solve some of its difficulties, and ap-

plies very well to our iron steed, whose skin and head are indeed *filled with sharp iron* bolts, and long rods like *spears*, yet it does not seem to remove all doubts as to the correctness of the meaning attributed to some of its expressions. For instance, as I have already remarked, it seems doubtful that the word (שְׂכוֹת) *souccoth*, has been correctly transcribed from the original manuscript.

I am of the opinion that there has been a serious transposition of letters here, and that instead of (שְׂכוֹת) *souccoth*, rendered *spears, nets;* we should read (סֻכּוֹת) *souccoth, booths, coverts.*

In Gesenius' Heb. Grammar (p. 19) we find, in reference to the difference formerly existing between the letters *sin*, and *samekh*, that, "At a later period this distinction was lost, and hence the Syrians employed only *samekh* for both, and the Arabians only *sin*. They also began to be interchanged even in the later Hebrew."

Taking *samekh* as having been the original letter at the beginning of the above word, then, according to Gesenius, it is possible that an Arabian scribe, not understanding to what this description referred, and consequently not being able to make the proper distinction between the words, introduced the letter *sin*, instead of the original *samekh*.

Taking the word as meaning *booths, coverts*, we would have as the meaning of this passage, "Wilt thou fill his skin with booths?" or, with the force of an affirmative, "Wilt thou *not* fill

his skin with booths?" Here applies, in favor of my interpretation of the word, the singular rendering of the Vulgate, which has *nets;* an expression chosen, undoubtedly, for its being the nearest to the original import of the word, and as more suitable than *booths* or *lairs*, in connection with what was supposed to be meant here, viz., the entrapping or slaying of an enormous sea monster. Then, as to the difficulties in the second member of this verse, the rendering of the Vulgate, although it is quite different from all others, is more likely to have given us the proper meaning of the word (צְלָצַל) *tslatsal*, viz., *cabin.* But here instead of *a cabin of fishes*, I would read *a cabin of fishermen*, as being probably the original reading. This would give us as the meaning of this entire verse: "Wilt thou *not* fill his skin with booths, and his head with a cabin of fishermen."

Can the reader ever imagine to what this might be intended to refer? It seems even more problematical than any version which has been proposed for the solution of these difficulties. Indeed, it seems the height of absurdity to ask, if the skin, or body, of a monster serpent can be filled with booths or coverts. And if a fisherman's cabin could be placed over his head.

But viewing this in its possible application to our long, extended and snake-like passenger train, can the reader find about it anything like *booths* or *births* with which it is *filled*, according to the requirements of the words of Job?

At the head of this monster serpent, can he perceive *a cabin*, like that which often runs up through the deck of a ship, or which is set up on the deck of a fisherman's vessel, something like a pilot house? If so, then it is possible that these seemingly unintelligible words of Job, have a far more real and wonderful application for us than would appear at first sight.

But who could have dreamt that, in this difficult verse, was hidden and sealed, thirty-five centuries ago, such a wonderful revelation for our days.

Yes, undoubtedly, here we have before us most positive evidence that this description applies directly to our modern passenger train and palace sleeping coaches, *filled with booths and berths* for its passengers.

A train of empty coaches is as a long empty shell; or but a skin, as it were, with no life or body in it; which readily accounts for the strange expression which Job makes use of in saying, that it was the *skin* of this serpent-like monster which was *filled with booths*, but not, in reality, his body.

As to the *cabin* which seems to have been somewhere about the head of this monster, it is easily recognized as being the engineer's cabin, which is indeed somewhat like the cabin of a small ship, or like a pilot house, and situated at the head of the train, close to the engine. How singular and suggestive to find here also the very name by which this shelter is called in our days, viz., a cabin.

Once more comes to our assistance, in revealing the mysteries and beauties of this passage, our steaming and bright-eyed monster with his long and serpent-like body. There he goes, literally filled with booths and berths, and with travellers whom he picks up on his way. There stands at his head that identical cabin pointed out to Job and to us by the Lord Himself.

I cannot pass without notice the extraordinary rendering of this verse by the Septuagint. They have: "Παν δὲ πλουτον συνελθὸν οὐ μὴ ἐνέγκωδί βυρδαν μίαν οὐρᾶς αντοῦ, εν πλοίοις αλίεων κεφαλὴν αντοῦ," which I render: "All that is navigable united together, cannot carry one skin (fold) of his tail, nor his head in all the fishermen's boats."

This could not have been intended as a translation of the present Hebrew verse, but probably as a gloss. Possibly, they have been guided, in this, by other manuscripts or traditions. For I must say that, from my views of the reference of this description, it is a most remarkable passage. I cannot see how they could have expressed themselves in such an appropriate and forcible manner without having some knowledge of the true nature of the leviathan.

Taking the leviathan as referring more specially here to a locomotive with a full train of coaches all linked together, he would appear as a monster fiery-flying serpent. His head would be the locomotive, and the long-extended train, his tail. Now by "one skin of his tail" the Septuagint might have intended to refer to any of these

ponderous coaches (folds), which, true enough, all the small fishing smacks of those days could not have carried, much less could they have carried his head, viz., the locomotive itself.

To me the Septuagint seems to have seized an essential fact in this case, viz., that it was not strictly the body of this monster which was here meant, but some other part, which they render "the skin of his tail," or the covering of what formed his long tail; which suits very well the hollow and shell-like construction of our railroad coaches, and the idea contained in the words of Job. Again, they seem to have read *fishermen* instead of *fishes;* the very reading which I have suggested.

Either of the interpretations which I have proposed for the elucidation of this verse, applies very well to our newly discovered leviathan, although I give preference to the latter. Consequently I render: "Wilt thou not fill his skin with booths, and his head with a cabin of fishermen."

THE CONTENDING FORCES THAT ARE WITHIN HIM.

Verse 8.

שִׂים־	Place	Pone
עָלָיו	upon him	super eum
כַּפֶּךָ	thy hand;	manum tuam;
זְכֹר	remember	memento
מִלְחָמָה	the conflict; no further	belli; nec
אַל־תּוֹסֵף׃	thou wilt add *questions*.	ultra addas loqui.

"Lay thine hand upon him, remember the battle, do no more."

THIS verse has none of the difficulties of previous ones. Neither are the original expressions as equivocal as some which have so sorely tried the patience and erudition of our best scholars. Yet it does not seem to have been any better understood than the rest.

It would be quite significant to say, under these circumstances, that they seem to be "on the wrong track." Hence the many difficulties they meet with in their application of even the simplest passages.

Most commentators have found grave difficulties here, as it did not seem reasonable that the Lord would command Job to place his hand on any

of the ferocious monsters to which they supposed allusion was here made.

They have also had some trouble with the expression (אַל־תּוֹסֵף) *al-tosaph*, which they render, *do no more*, *thou wilt not do it again*, *go no further*. The rendering of the Vulgate would be more likely to have expressed its true meaning, which I also consider to be, that, by placing one's hand upon this monster, he will acquire full knowledge of his nature, and will *add no further* questions.

The passage which has been rendered in almost all versions by *remember the battle*, or *beware of the conflict*, has been generally understood of a battle which would be likely to take place if any one was so daring as to place his hand upon this monster. I am not of this opinion, but am convinced that this command to Job to place his hand upon him, was simply that he might acquire, thereby, the knowledge of the strange and peculiar nature of this creature, or of something which could not be readily noticed otherwise. Undoubtedly Job felt most anxious to know all about this terrible looking monster; and the Lord answers this sentiment by saying to him: Place thy hand upon him . . . and you will add no further questions."

Had it been an evidently wild and ferocious monster which was here alluded to—as all suppose—this warning would not have been necessary. Neither can we imagine that Job would have been advised to place his hand on such a

creature, that he might find out its dangerous character.

From the original words themselves, it seems to me quite evident that what Job is told to remember, or to beware of, lies in some peculiar *conflict* of forces, or internal emotions, not noticeable to the sight, but which would be readily called to mind by the very touch of him. Hence I consider the meaning of this verse to be: "Place thy hand upon him, be mindful of the *terrible* conflict, and you will add no further questions."

I can well understand that the meaning of this verse was not very plain to those who looked upon the leviathan as a wild and ferocious animal, or a monster sea serpent, for Job is here, evidently, commanded to place his hand upon him, which would seem to be a dangerous proceeding. Although it must be inferred, from this command, that the act was quite practicable, and that this monster could be captured in some way, and even so securely bound that one could place his hand upon his back. But what could this be intended to prove? Certainly not the strength of this monster, nor the impenetrability of his shield.

It is plain that Job was not told to beware of any of the exterior parts of this creature, such as his mouth, his claws or his tail; but rather to beware of some terrible and dangerous *conflict* or *battling* of some kind; and that after he had placed his hand upon him, he would fully realize the nature of this conflict, and would ask no further questions.

As to the probable correctness of these views, I would refer to the extraordinary and, surely, impartial rendering of this verse by the Septuagint.

That the reader may judge for himself, I will quote the original Greek version, it reads:

"*Επιθησεις δὲ αυτῶ χειρα, μνησθεις πολεμον τον γινομενεν εν στοματι αυτου, και μηκετι γενεσθω,*" which means: "Place thy hand upon him, be mindful of the conflict which begins in his mouth, and thou wilt not begin again." This is a still more wonderful statement than that which we find in the Hebrew. They say that this conflict, of which one must beware, begins in this monster's mouth. Evidently it is this contest which can be felt by placing one's hand upon his back; and it would seem to be of such a nature that, if you try this operation once you will not venture to do it again. What could this have meant to those who looked upon the leviathan as a monster of the deep, or as a cold, slimy crocodile? As they cannot explain it they pass it unnoticed.

In his notes on this (Hebrew) passage, Barnes says: "The meaning of the passage evidently is—Endeavor to seize him by laying the hand on him, and you will soon desist from the fearful conflict, and will not renew it." But this, evidently, cannot be the true meaning, since we are told that one cannot grapple on to him neither with iron hooks nor spears, (xli. 27, 29).

How then could Job be advised to grapple on to him with his bare hands. And if this monster were an animal, securely bound, then what

danger could there be to any one if he placed his hand on his back? Yet one is told to beware, and that he who did it once would not repeat it again.

Prof. Lee explains this passage thus: "Lay on him, *i.e.* concerning him, thy hand to thy mouth, in token of silence and astonishment." In explanation he says: "It cannot be meant, surely, that the hand is to be laid on this terrific animal; yet Rosenmüller has here: 'Injice ei *volam tuam*, *i.e.*, si injicere ei ausus fueris, recordari, etc.' Bochart, 'Cum ipso tactu compereris cutem esse illi contra omnem ictum invictam.' But surely, there could be no necessity for touching the animal in order to ascertain this, in the one case; nor for putting the man in mind, in the other, that the contest would be a very unequal one. This would be just as much as to say: 'If you cannot believe my statement, make the trial for yourself,' when in fact, the whole argument proceeds on the assumption, that enough is known to need no such experiment; and to this the subsequent context bears its testimony.

"On my view the general sense would be: The character of this animal, or class of animals, is such as to excite the deepest dread and astonishment, even in its contemplation; much more upon the supposition of its being encountered single-handed. Forbear then, even to think of such a project."

So, Prof. Lee sees a real difficulty here, and

cannot admit that any one could have been earnestly advised to lay his hand on this terrible animal.

Such a conclusion is certainly very natural for any one who supposes that the leviathan represents a dangerous wild animal. Yet I propose to overcome all these great difficulties without doing quite as much violence to the Hebrew text as the Professor has done; for I cannot admit that it can be constructed into "Lay thy hand on thy mouth concerning him." His argument is, otherwise, greatly in my favor, at least in so far as it goes to show that Job could not have been requested to place his hand on a dangerous wild monster; and that there is no evident necessity for such an act in the way of proving either his strength on his impenetrability.

From the manner in which the Lord addressed Job, it might be inferred that this creature was present before them. Yet it does not appear that any one has seriously entertained this opinion; still it is quite probable that the Lord fully revealed this monster to Job at the moment He was addressing him; no contrary inference could be drawn from any passage in this description.

Who has not dreams or visions in which he sees and feels the objects before him with all their peculiar attributes, just as though these were, in reality, before him at the moment. We may therefore readily understand the possibility of Job fully realizing the peculiar nature of this monster even by some such means. Although

it does not appear that it was during his sleep that he heard and saw these things, yet his condition, at the moment, might have been such that he fully realized the nature of all that he saw, the same as though it were, in reality, all present before him.

Again this vision must have occurred at Job's own residence, and in the very presence of the friends who had called on him. Therefore, even had this monster been a crocodile, it must have been present only in vision, unless we suppose that Job and his friends were, at that moment, in the marshes of some river, and in the very midst of these dangerous creatures; which would not only be very doubtful, but, really, a preposterous supposition. It being evidently a vision, Job might have been made to see a monster of our country as well as one of Southern Africa.

Having thus given the pro and con of the most difficult points in this verse, and shown, as far as possible, the merits and weakness of several versions and comments, I will now undertake to show that there is no animal known to which the extraordinary circumstances described in this verse, could apply better than to our modern locomotive.

Supposing, to illustrate, that a *live* locomotive, or steam boiler, stood before you, and that you were told, in the very words of this verse, "Place thy hand upon him, be mindful of the *internal* conflict, or battling forces," would you be puzzled

to understand to what the meaning of this internal conflict, referred?

As every one knows, the boiler of a steam engine is always kept partially filled with boiling water which is heated by a raging fire in the furnace.

Consequently the iron boiler gets to be very hot, and as the fire increases the water boils with greater fury, till the constantly increasing pressure, bound up within its iron flanks, becomes a terrible source of danger. Now place your hand on this hot iron boiler and see how quickly you will realize the importance and propriety of the warning given to Job; indeed one will not be apt to try it again, nor ask any further questions, for he will know the whole secret. On the other hand, when one realizes the terrible *conflict of forces* taking place within this monster's iron-bound body, he will not be likely to venture too close to him unnecessarily.

Let us now try this same application in the solution of that extraordinary version of the Septuagint. They render: "Place thine hand upon him, be mindful of the conflict which begins in his mouth, and thou wilt not begin again." The food of the steam engine is coals of fire. Naturally, in a highly figurative description like this, *the mouth* of this monster, may be considered to be intended for that part through which it receives this food. With the steam engine, this would be the fire-box. Now the Septuagint say that this conflict—of which Job

is here warned—begins in this monster's mouth. This is precisely the case with our monster.

Inside of it a terrible conflict is raging between two opposed elements, fire and water. This conflict virtually begins *in the mouth*, or furnace, of the boiler; for there, is lighted the fire which is the very beginning of this contest.

I am really puzzled to know how the Septuagint discovered this important fact; for nothing of the kind now appears in the Hebrew text.

This verse is certainly another powerful link in the already strong chain of evidences in favor of my views. If the reader is not convinced, I would say to him as the Lord said unto Job: "Place thy hand upon him, be mindful of the *internal* conflict, and you will add no further questions."

WHEN HIS STRENGTH FAILS HE IS SCATTERED TO ATOMS.

Verse 9.

הֵן־תּוֹחַלְתּוֹ	Behold, his hope, confidence	Ecce, spes ejus
נִכְזָבָה	being deceived, made false,	frustrabitur eum,
הַגַּם	shall *not* at once	et
אֶל־מַרְאָיו	his mighty form, looks	videntibus cunctis
יָטַל׃	be spread out, cast down?	præcipitabitur.

"Behold, the hope of him is in vain; shall not one be cast down even at the sight of him?"

We have seen, in the previous verse, that one is admonished to be careful in laying his hands upon the leviathan, and to beware because of the terrible raging force bound up within him.

From an attentive and laborious study of the verse under consideration, I am convinced that it has an immediate reference to the effects of these powerful pent-up forces.

One will not fail to notice this, when he once understands the true meaning and reference of the original quoted above.

The literal translation of it has caused me no little vexation on account of the conflicting views met with among high authorities.

All the commentaries I have read, look upon the expression (תּוֹחַלְתּוֹ) *tochaletto*, as referring to the *hope* or *confidence* of the one who would dare lay hold onto the leviathan, whilst it evidently refers to the hope or confidence of the leviathan itself. Otherwise to what could the words (אֶל־מַרְאָיו) *el-marav*, refer, as they evidently mean, *his mighty form*, or *looks?* Certainly this could not refer to Job who, at that moment, must have been quite weak and emaciated from his long sufferings. Then the personal pronouns are not in the second person, which would have been the case had the Lord intended these words to apply to the same one whom he addresses in the previous verse.

The Vulgate comes the nearest to the original, it has: "Behold, his hope will deceive him, and, in the sight of all, he will be cast down."

It does not seem quite evident of whom is here predicated the action of being deceived, and cast down. One might as well infer, from the above, that it was the monster who would be overthrown at the sight of Job, as that it would be Job himself, or some one else.

The last words of the previous verse would appear to settle the question, as far as Job was concerned.

It would seem that after once placing his hand upon this monster's back, he would ask no further questions. Hence we must infer that he would not run the risk of a contest with him.

Barnes supposes that the meaning is, that the

appearance of this monster will be so formidable that the courage of any one attacking him would be daunted, and his resolution fail.

As to its reference to any one who would attack him, I cannot see that there has been a question of any such third person in the previous verses, nor of any such attack. Yet as the words of this passage clearly indicate that the one alluded to has already been spoken of, it seems most natural that we should suppose that it was the leviathan himself. Indeed the reference to his great confidence, and his mighty form, can leave no doubt that it is he that is meant.

Thus the idea would be that, this monster's confidence in his great strength, or in that of his shields, being deceived, he will be cast down or rather *spread asunder*. This last meaning of the original word is very significant here, as it would indicate that the power that would cause him to spread asunder, must be located within himself.

And here would be also a strong indication that this destructive power is the very conflict of which Job is warned in the previous verse.

If we start out with the supposition that the leviathan refers to some wild animal, we will surely be at a loss to understand the reason for such a strange statement. According to the original, this *casting down*, or *spreading asunder*, seems accounted as something wonderful and strange of this monster, something not in the common order of things;

for one's attention is called to it abruptly by the exclamation—Behold! as if something extraordinary and worthy of special attention, was to take place. Then follows the statement of what will happen *all at once*, if his confidence or strength should have deceived him.

Let us now apply these, apparently, strange assertions to the no less strange capacities of our modern dragon, which has been here personified for the purpose of adding to the poetry of this description. His power, which is steam, lies in the centre of his body. And *his hope*, or *the confidence* he has in his strength, is based entirely on the thickness and quality of the material of which his body (the boiler) is made. Some boilers are made to stand an enormous pressure.

But should the boiler, through defective workmanship, or for want of tensile strength in the materials employed in its construction, be incapable of holding the enormous pressure for which it was intended, *at once* a terrific explosion takes place, and the powerful and majestic form of this monster is demolished and *scattered over the ground.*

Could the poetic words of Job find their fulfilment in anything grander and more appropriate than this? It is in unison with all that has preceded. It fulfills every letter of the text, and brings out its full force and beauty without doing violence to a single word.

How poetic the idea and the expression, "Behold! his confidence being deceived." Here he is represented as one who relies with confidence on

his armor, the strength of which has been guaranteed to him by its makers. But, behold, they have deceived him. He was guaranteed an armor that would stand his greatest exertions; and full of confidence he starts to accomplish his task. But, lo! His deceptive armor gives way. His massive bones of iron are broken and twisted like straws. His bands of brass become like rotten wood. His formidable body is spread asunder; and his head, and his limbs, and his ribs, and his mighty form are scattered over the ground.

Alas, at times, his ambition is also too great; he presumes too much on his strength and capacity, and in his mighty rage to distance all competitors, either on sea or on land, he bursts the sinews of his strength and turns his proud and defiant form into a ridiculous mass of fragments.

Here the query of the Septuagint is quite apropos. They ask: "Hast thou not seen him? Art thou not astonished at all that is related of him?"

To both of these questions we are now in a position to answer: Yes, we have seen him, and we are greatly astonished at all that Job relates of him; and we now understand to what he referred when he said: "Behold, his confidence being deceived, shall not at once his mighty form be spread asunder?"

WHO WILL VENTURE TO STAND BEFORE HIM?

Verse 10.

לֹא־אַכְזָר	None so bold	Non quasi
כִּי	that	crudelis
יְעִירֶנּוּ	he will stir up this one	suscitabo eum ;
וּמִי	and *none* who	Quis
הֵיא	then	enim
לְפָנַי	in front (before his face)	vultui meo
יִתְיַצָּב׃	will place himself.	resistere potest?

"None so fierce that dare stir him up ;
Who then is able to stand before me?"

THERE exists a great difference between the various renderings of the first part of this verse. The Vulgate, as you notice above, is quite different from the English version. And the Septuagint differ widely from both. It is evident that the latter did not confine themselves to our present Hebrew text. They render: "I have not feared that he might be made ready against me; who indeed can oppose himself to me?" Not a word of this first hemistich occurs in the original. I cannot see how these seventy great scholars could have agreed on such a rendering.

Instead of "none so fierce," I would prefer translating "none so bold;" for it is not so much

fierceness which is here required, as *boldness*. Barnes renders: "None is so courageous that he dare arouse him; and who then is he that can stand before me?" His opinion is that no one would have courage enough to rouse and provoke him. Of the second hemistich he says: "The meaning of this is plain. It is: If one of my creatures is so formidable that man dare not attack it, how can he contend with the great Creator? This may perhaps be designed as a reproof of Job. He had expressed a desire to carry his cause before God. How could he presume to contend with God?"

I cannot take this view of the above passage. Neither can I see why the Lord would intend, here, to reprimand his holy servant Job; when, in a subsequent chapter, he praises him for having spoken right of him. Neither can I find the required similarity which should exist between the two parallel cases which, according to the above views, would be here intended.

On one hand, it is a righteous and greatly afflicted man who, in the sincerity of his heart and in the full conviction of his innocence, expresses the wish that he could be allowed to plead his case before his Creator, wishing, by the expression of this sentiment, to prove to his friends that he was not guilty of their accusations, and did not fear being condemned by his Creator, if he could only carry his case before Him. Now, is it probable that this righteous and afflicted servant of God would, in this case,

be likened to a fierce and bold man, who, nevertheless, would not have the courage to stand in the presence of a wild monster, who would be likely to devour him? Is there any similarity between these two cases? Surely Job's sincerity cannot be taken for presumption, as in the case of the *fierce* and *bold* man. Neither is it evident that Job wished to contend with the Lord, or oppose himself to Him, as must be inferred to be the case in this *supposed* comparison of him to one who would dare stand boldly in front of such a monster as this.

On the other hand, would not God be comparing Himself here to a terrible monster, who would be likely to tear such a man to pieces?

These few reflections are, of themselves, sufficient to cause us to condemn the interpretations which have been given of this passage, and also the present reading of the original, which has given rise to them.

The cause of all the trouble which translators and exegetists have had with this verse can easily be traced to the Hebrew word (לְפָנַי) *lephanay*, rendered *before me*. I am convinced that this word is simply the adjective (לִפְנַי) *liphnay*, meaning *front, in front;* or that the original manuscript must have read (לְפָנָיו) *lephanav*, *before him*, *in front of him;* and not *before me*.

In searching for evidence to confirm my views, I have just found Umbreit's commentary, in which I read the following important remarks on this passage. It has: "Instead of (לְפָנַי) *lephanay*,

before me, several codd. read (לְפָנָיו) *lephanav*, *before him;* which, if referred to the leviathan, though it may seem to be an improvement, in reality enfeebles the sense."

I leave it to the reader to judge whether, in the present light of the question, it does tend to *enfeeble the sense*. It is remarkable, and important to me, to find that some manuscripts confirm my views. I hope that the other corrections which I have proposed may be equally sustained by evidence from other ancient readings. Unfortunately, I have none to consult.

According to the above explanations, this verse would have the following meaning: "None so bold that he will stir up this one; and *none* who will then place himself before his face."

No one will deny that this agrees better with the context, and with the subject under consideration, than any reading which has been proposed. As to its application to a locomotive, it is so astonishingly natural that one cannot help recognizing it. It is a government law that all steam boilers shall be tested, and that none shall carry more pressure than allowed, which is generally a great deal less than its full capacity. Now to run a boiler to its full capacity, that is, beyond the limit of safety, or to excite it to a foaming rage, is an act that the bravest engineer would not be bold enough to do. And this is what is here meant by the words, "None is so bold that he will stir him up," viz., cause him to rage, or push him to that point when he becomes furious and danger-

ous. Now comes in the propriety of the idea expressed in the second part of the verse.

Here is a raging monster stirred up to full speed, "Who is so bold that he will place himself before his face?" Any one can appreciate the full force of these words, if he will place himself in front of a locomotive coming at full speed; he will soon realize that he dare not stand firm before his face. In this verse I find also a full confirmation of the opinion I expressed at the beginning, viz., that the leviathan referred more specially to a locomotive, or self-propelling engine.

Unless the reference here were to something moving forward very swiftly, there could be no such danger in simply standing before him. For one can stand without much fear or danger before a stationary engine; but the case would be quite different for one who would attempt to face our lightning express, or Cannon-Ball trains.

Were it a wild monster, there would be as much danger in standing *near him* as, *before his face.*

Here, with this leviathan, the danger seems to be in standing directly in front of him. This again would point out our locomotive as the one alluded to, as the only danger is in placing oneself before his face.

This verse will now be found to have quite a different meaning from that heretofore attributed to it; and I am confident that it will, henceforth, be recognized to be: "There is none so bold that he will stir up this one *to rage;* and *none* who will then place himself before his face."

NONE BUT THE LIKE OF HIMSELF CAN COMPETE WITH HIM.

Verse 11.

מִי	Who	Quis ante
הִקְדִּימַנִי (-נּוּ)	hath preceded this one	dedit mihi
וַאֲשַׁלֵּם	and will remain in safety, endure?	ut reddam ei?
תַּחַת	under	omnia quæ
כָּל־הַשָּׁמָיִם	the whole heavens	sub cœlo sunt
לִי־הוּא	(לוֹלִי) none unless himself.	mea sunt.

"Who hath prevented me that I should repay him? Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine."

THIS is another of the vexed passages. As it now reads in the Hebrew its difficulties are so great that I have no hesitancy in saying that the original has been tampered with; and this for the evident purpose of making it harmonize with sentiments expressed in the previous verse and which, as we have seen, were entirely foreign to the subject. In both instances the whole trouble has been caused by the personal pronoun of the first person being wrongly put for that of the secoud person.

Here instead of (הִקְדִּימַנִי) *hikeddimani*, *who hath prevented me*, we should read (הִקְדִּימַנּוּ) *hikeddimennou*, *who hath prevented him*. I am

satisfied that those who may have access to ancient manuscripts will find this reading corroborated. The proper meaning of the word here is not *to prevent*, but *to precede*, *to go before*. Consequently the meaning is, *who will precede this one*, or, *who will go before him*. The word may also be taken in the sense of *to compete*, *to oppose* oneself to another.

In many of our versions words have been here substituted which are not warranted by the original. The "ut reddam ei" of the Vulgate, rendered, "that I should repay him," is far from the idea conveyed by the original expression, which means *to remain in safety*, *to endure*, *to continue*. I consider that this word read, originally (וְיִשְׁלָם) *veyishlam*.

According to this the meaning of this passage would be very plain and appropriate, viz., who will precede this one, and will continue in safety? or, who will attempt to run before him, and will endure?

In another sense of the word we may render: "Who will stand up in competition before him and endure?" This may apply as well to the unequalled capacity of the leviathan for work as to its unsurpassable swiftness in flight.

In the previous verse we were told that no one would be so bold as to stand firm before him at his approach. Here the same idea of his rapidity in flight is not only continued, but is intensified: "None can successfully oppose himself in front of him." Could this sweeping as-

sertion be made of the hippopotamus, or of a crocodile? I fear for their laurels when pitted against our great leviathan.

As to the views of others concerning this verse and its difficulties, as it now reads, I would here quote Barnes; he says: "As this verse is here rendered, its meaning, and the reason why it is introduced, are not very apparent.

"It almost looks, indeed, as if it were an interpolation, or had been introduced from some other place, and torn from its proper connections . . . But perhaps the true idea of the passage may be arrived at by adverting to the meaning of the word rendered 'prevented'—(קִדַּם) *quadam*. It properly means in Piel, to go before; to precede, to anticipate . . . Then it means to rush upon suddenly, to seize, to go to meet any one . . . If some idea of this kind be supposed to be conveyed by the word here, it will probably express the true meaning. "Who is able to seize upon me suddenly, or when I am off guard, to anticipate my watchfulness and power of resistance . . .?"

All this is very well, especially as it is an excellent proof of how difficult the present reading of the Hebrew is, since it looks as if it were an interpolation. But I hope I have succeeded in throwing some light upon this dark passage, and in establishing its true meaning which, contrary to the opinion of the above learned exponent, refers to the incapacity of any competitor to stand successfully before the leviathan, and not to man's opposition to God.

Of all the versions that I have seen, the Sept. are decidedly the nearest to the Hebrew, as far as the first part of this verse is concerned. But they also seem to have read *me*, instead of *him*. They render: "Who will oppose *me*, and will endure?" *To oppose*, and *to endure*, is exactly the meaning which I contend that the Hebrew words have respectively, and not that of *giving*, and *repaying;* as a revised version has: "Who has first given me, that I should repay?"

As to the second hemistich, none seem to have been able to confine themselves to the words of the original, and make any sense of it. It is a very difficult passage, and unless the first is perfectly well understood, there remains very little chance to render this one properly, on account of its great brevity.

The first part of this verse, as we have seen, is in the interrogative—"Who will precede this one, and continue in safety?" Now the second will be found to contain the answer.

The Vulgate renders it: "All things under the heavens are mine." The Septuagint have: "If every thing under the heavens is mine." All modern versions are worded after these.

I cannot find in the Hebrew any word corresponding to the "Omnia quæ . . . sunt" of the Vulgate—all things that are.

The original has simply, "under the whole heavens," as you will notice by referring to the beginning. Consequently their is no authority for the addition, in our versions, of the words, "what-

soever is." This leaves very little chance to make any sense out of this passage with the remaining expression (לִי־הוּא) *li-hou*, if we accept it to mean *is mine.*

No other explanation can suit this than that (לִי) *li*, is an abbreviation or shortening of (לוּלֵי) *loulay* meaning, *unless*, *if*, *if not.* Or that it read, originally, (לֹא) *lo*, *no*, *none*, then the meaning would be—none *but* himself.

This would give to this entire verse the following plausible and extraordinary meaning: "Who, under the whole heaven, will precede this one and continue in safety, unless himself?"

Or in the sense of *no*, *none*, we may render "Who will precede this one, and continue in safety? Under the whole heaven none but himself." According to this, then, none can be pitted —in the race—against a leviathan and endure, none under the whole heaven, *unless it be* another leviathan.

This is certainly quite a different meaning from that which has been universally attributed to this verse up to this day. But who will not now recognize that the former is very unsatisfactory, not at all in keeping with either the context or the general drift, of this description?

On the other hand the full power and beauty of this verse can be easily appreciated when interpreted of the great speed of our engines and express trains, and of their unsurpassable endurance on a long run. How true, indeed, to say of our swift-fleeing monster that none, under the

whole heaven, can stand before him, or, compete with him successfully, unless it be one like unto himself.

There is nothing that can compete with a railroad, unless it be another railroad. Or with a steamship, unless it be another steamship.

From this it would seem that we could predicate that nothing will ever supersede steam.

Although great thing are expected of electricity, yet, so far, steam is its generator.

This verse will now be found to be far more interesting to us than expected as, evidently, its meaning is: "Who will precede this one and remain in safety? Under the whole heaven none unless himself."

Here, once more, the well-known capacities of our fiery steed help us to unravel the almost obliterated inscriptions of an ancient parchment, and enable us to restore to its primitive beauty an old and much abused masterpiece.

HE IS A MASTERPIECE OF BEAUTY AND STRENGTH.

Verse 12.

לֹא־אַחֲרִישׁ	I will not pass in silence	Non parcam
בַּדָּיו	his members, parts,	ei
וּדְבַר	nor the matter of	et verbis
גְּבוּרוֹת	his powers, mighty forces,	potentibus
וְחֵן	nor the beauty	et ad deprecandum
עֶרְכּוֹ׃	of his equipment.	compositis.

"I will not conceal his parts, nor his power, nor his comely proportions."

The true meaning and reference of this verse are not so easily arrived at as one might suppose. The difficulties met with are almost as great as those in the two previous ones. Therefore I cannot wonder at its various renderings.

The Vulgate, as you see above, has passed over the word (בַּדָּיו) *baddav*, which I consider to refer here to the *limbs*, or *members* of the leviathan, or possibly to the *various parts* of his structure, as the root (בַּד) *bad*, would indicate.

That this is the proper meaning of the word, seems to be indicated also by the verses which immediately follow, which are descriptive of various parts of the leviathan, such as his cover-

ing, the doors of his facings, the strength of his shields, etc. The Vulgate is so different from all other versions that one would be inclined to believe that it had followed some entirely different manuscript; it has: "I will not spare him, nor his powerful utterances framed for the purpose of entreaty." This, as strange as it may appear, would agree remarkably well with the powerful utterances of our locomotives, and with the very purpose for which they are uttered, which is, to give warning of their approach and to entreat passers-by to keep out of their way.

With the exception of the Vulgate and the Sept., most versions omit the important word (דָּבָר) *dabar*. It means, primarily, *a word, an utterance;* then, *the cause*, *mode* or *reason* of a thing.

In the sense of *utterance*, it would mean here, in connection with the word *powers*, which immediately follows it, the utterance of great powers, or forces. This would certainly apply, in a very direct manner, to the noise made by the escaping forces of steam.

At this very instant a powerful locomotive is passing within a few yards of the spot where I am reviewing these notes; and as if to impress deeply upon my mind the sense and great force of these words, he is puffing with all his might; belching forth repeated utterances of those mighty forces so securely bound up within his iron flanks, and to which (forces) Job evidently refers here.

We have already been informed, in verse third, that his utterances are terrible and imperative. This was in reference to the loud and thrilling warnings which an engine gives of its approach. Whilst in this verse, *the utterances of his powers*, would seem to refer more directly to the continual manifestations of these forces by the constant puffing of an engine as it moves on, and which is caused by the escaping of the exhausted steam after each stroke of the piston upon which it has exerted its power. It is therefore most truly *the utterance of his powers*, or *forces*, or, the noise which is made by the rushing forth of steam as it escapes from the cylinders through the smokestack. Undoubtedly Job could have constructed a steam engine had he had the means at hand, so perfectly and poetically has he described even its most secret workings.

Although the above meaning of the words is quite applicable to the well-known capacities of our monster for terrific utterances, yet the word *dabar* may be taken as meaning here, the *matter*, *cause* or *reason* of a thing. Then the sense would be, *the matter*, or *cause of the mighty forces;* that is: "I will not pass in silence his members, nor *the matter of his mighty forces. . . .*"

This would also be a most wonderful and direct reference to the mighty forces of steam, which are pent up within the flanks of our monster, and which are of such vital importance that indeed, according to the word of this verse, they cannot be passed over in silence.

We may also infer from these words that *these mighty forces* will be alluded to in some of the verses which will follow.

Let us now see what the Septuagint thought of this difficult verse. They render it: "I will not be silent concerning him, nor be merciful *concerning* his powerful voice, equal in strength to himself." This is not a strictly literal rendering of the original Hebrew. That part, referring to the beauty of his equipment, has also been omitted. But what they say concerning the voice of this monster is certainly very extraordinary. As you have noticed, they look upon his voice as being equal in strength to himself; that is, that this monster's voice is of the same power, or strength, as that which causes him to move or to act. The question arises—How could this be said of an animal?

It often happens that very powerful creatures have but a very faint voice, and none of them have such a voice that it could be said to be equal in strength to their own great muscular power; for the power of the voice depends on quite a different set of muscles from that of the body and limbs. The only explanation would seem to be that the Septuagint perceived, in the original, some indication that the force which imparted the strength to this monster's voice was of the same nature and equal in strength to that which constituted his power. If so, it is reasonable to suppose that they became aware that this description could not refer to a ferocious

animal, but to some mechanical contrivance; and that the force which gave power to it also furnished the power for its voice; consequently the extraordinary rendering which they have left us.

Be this as it may, the words of the Sept., could find no better elucidation, nor application, than in the well-known facts concerning our steam monster, whose voice is produced by exactly the same force that gives him his power to move; and the greater that force is, the more powerful are his utterances; so that, indeed, the strength of his voice is equal to his power, and similar to it in its nature.

As to "the beauty of his equipment," referred to in the last part of this verse, it must be conceded that this could not apply to the crocodile; for there is surely no beauty nor grace in his form, nor in his rough and slimy skin, nor in his miserably short and crooked limbs.

Albert Barnes himself, in explanation of the fifth verse where it is asked: "Wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?" says: "There is great force in this question, on the supposition that the crocodile is intended. Nothing could be more incongruous than the idea of securing *so rough* and *unsightly* a monster for the amusement of tender and delicate females."

In reference to the same passage Prof. Lee remarks: "But how this can apply either to the crocodile, or the whale, it is beyond my powers of vision to see. No animals, perhaps, are more ill-favored in form than these."

So that, here again, our learned exponents are at a great loss to account for this beauty of the entire equipment of the leviathan.

They have made him, all along, such a horrible and ferocious wild monster that they cannot now make this great beauty of all his parts harmonize with their views.

But now let us take a glance at our bright-eyed and smooth-skinned monster.

Behold how comely in all his parts; how beautiful in all his proportions. How gracefully his whole armor fits; not a wrinkle; nothing loose, nor shaky.

He is a masterpiece of workmanship; beautiful to look at in the completeness of his equipment. His powerful limbs are skilfully wrought, and graceful in all their movements. He fairly shines with glory and pride. Yea, he is a fiery steed of great power and beauty.

This was found to be a very difficult verse when forced to apply to any known animal; but, when viewed in its possible reference to our modern masterpiece of beauty and strength, it becomes easy of application and quite proper and intelligible.

We have already recognized, in this description, our modern leviathan by his bones and by various parts of his body, which we have, as it were, exhumed one by one.

We have now succeeded in identifying him by the beauty of his equipment.

This is more than can be said of any of his competitors.

HIS SHIELDS CANNOT BE TORN ASUNDER.

Verse 13.

מִי־גָלָה	Who can strip off, uncover	Quis revelabit
פְּנֵי	the facings	faciem
לְבוּשׁוֹ	of his covering, jacket?	indumenti ejus?
בְּכֶפֶל	Between the double lap	et in medium
רִסְנוֹ	of his binding	oris ejus
מִי יָבוֹא׃	who can penetrate?	quis intrabit?

"Who can discover the face of his garment? or who can come to him with his double bridle?"

THE first part of this verse is easily understood; and the same meaning has generally been ascribed to it by all commentators, although many are doubtful as to what animal it may refer.

I would call special attention to the fact that the word rendered *face* is literally in the plural, and consequently should be rendered *faces*. But if we are to look upon this expression as referring to the entire covering of this monster, I would prefer rendering it by *facings*, as the word *faces* could not convey the proper meaning.

Moreover, as we will see hereafter, the body of this leviathan is said to be covered with shields closely fastened together; and I am convinced

that here reference is had to these same shields under the name of *facings*, because they served to *face* the entire body. We will see in the next verse that these separate shields, or facings, had *doors* or rather *heads*, and these heads were so tightly fastened that they could not be opened.

Consequently I render "Who can strip off the facings of his covering?" It is here clearly intimated that these facings formed his covering. And to indicate their tenacity and close union together, it is asked, "Who can strip them off?" inferring that those parts, which formed the hide of this creature, could not be as easily stripped off as the scales or hide of ordinary monsters.

It does not seem to me possible to apply this passage to the crocodile, as many do; for, indeed, his skin is very easily stripped from him, as is the skin of most animals. It is a wonder that some ingenious commentator did not think of applying this description to some monster turtle; this verse, at least, would have suited it remarkably well on account of this creature's back being formed, as it were, of numerous pieces, or small shields, closely united the one to the other, so much so indeed, that they cannot be stripped off like the hide of any other animal. It also possesses many other requisites of this description; it is amphibious; its jaws are terrible; you cannot place your hand on its back without danger; merchants part them among themselves; he cares very little for arrows and sling stones, and cannot be tamed for maidens

to play with, specially those monster sea-turtles, which weigh several hundred pounds.

I believe that such a turtle could show as good a title to the name of leviathan as the crocodile or hippopotamus.

As to the application of this passage to the body or boiler of the locomotive, I must say, that it is so self-evident that it hardly requires any further demonstration on my part. Everyone knows that the covering of the boiler is formed of numerous iron plates of uniform size, all rivetted and welded together; and that its general aspect is that of a piece of work made of various squares like a checker board, only its shape is tubular. These various squares or plates are undoubtedly the *facings* of which Job tells us that the covering of this monster was made. It is only in this light that we can fully appreciate the weight and propriety of his question, "Who can strip off the facings of his covering?" for it is indeed no easy task to strip off these iron plates one by one, as they are most firmly rivetted and welded together; and the labor, at times, costs nearly as much as the iron is worth

As to the second part of this verse, I cannot say of it what I have said of the first, for both commentators and translators differ widely. The Revised English version has, "Who shall come within his double bridle?" The Vulgate has, "Who will enter in the middle of his mouth?"

Prof. Lee renders; "Who can approach and place a surcingle in his nose?"

Gesenius and others suppose the meaning to be, "Into the doubling of his jaws, who can enter?"

The Septuagint render; "Between the doubling of his shield who can penetrate?"

Here are five different versions of the same passage, and the one quoted at the head of this chapter makes six, and no two of them are alike, yet they have all been derived from the same original Hebrew words. Which is right?

I naturally hesitate at the task of deciding among so many learned authors. Yet I will venture to say, that it seems to me, that the Septuagint have caught the correct idea, and have rendered the meaning of each word of the original most faithfully.

Some might object to their rendering of the word (רִסְנוֹ) *resen*, by *shield*, yet I expect to be able to show that it is the correct idea, although not the primary meaning of the word.

My own word for word translation of the passage is this, "Between the double lap of his binding who can penetrate?"

I have shown, in my explanation of the first part of this verse, that the body of this extraordinary monster must have been formed of separate plates, or facings, all rivetted and welded together. If so, these plates must have lapped the one over the other, forming a seam, and in many places, where it became necessary to "break joints," these plates must have formed a *double lap;* and this is what I consider that Job refers

to by—*the double lap of his binding;* or "the doubling of his shield"— as the Septuagint express it.

Anyone acquainted with the construction of a steam boiler knows that the rivetted seams, or laps, of the boiler plates become almost inseparable, and really constitute, on account of their double thickness, a stronger and more rigid binding, throughout the different parts of the entire surface, than if the boiler was made of one piece.

With these facts before us we can now fully comprehend the important bearing of these words, "Who can strip off the facing of his covering? Who can penetrate between the double laps of his binding?"

THE DOORS OF HIS ARMOR ARE FULL OF TERRIBLE TEETH.

Verse 14.

דַּלְתֵי	The doors	Portas
פָּנָיו	of his facings, (shields),	vultus ejus
מִי פָתַח	who can force open?	quis aperiet?
סְבִיבוֹת	The circuits	Per gyrum
שִׁנָּיו	of his teeth (iron bolts)	dentium ejus
אֵימָה׃	are formidable.	formido.

"Who can open the doors of his face? His teeth are terrible roundabout."

We have just seen to what the word *facings* referred. The same word must, undoubtedly, have the same meaning in this verse. As I have shown, these facings, or shields, represent the numerous iron plates which form the circular envelope of the steam boiler, which is tubular in form. Now, according to the present verse, we are led to understand that this circular envelope, or tube, formed of numerous facings, had doors. To what can this refer?

I must admit that the solution of this new problem puzzled me for some time.

All the translations and commentaries that I

consulted only served to complicate this seemingly hopeless case.

Finally I found it to be—as it generally turns out when we once know how—the simplest thing in the world.

In the previous verse reference is had only to the construction of the tubular envelope of the boiler. Nothing is said of the two heads which are necessary to close up the ends of this huge tube. Now I find that it is these very heads to which Job refers under the appellation of *doors*. Indeed what are doors, if not certain devices for closing an opening. In this instance they are large circular plates of malleable, or cast iron, which are made to fit closely into each end of the boiler, and the encircling iron plates, or *facings*, are firmly secured to these heads by means of one or two rows of sharp-headed bolts, the heads of which appear very prominently above the iron plates. The lap or seam of each iron plate is also encircled with these bolts, so that the entire boiler is covered with furrows of iron bolts. And this is what is meant by "the circuits of his teeth are formidable;" and they present indeed a formidable appearance.

The Hebrew word rendered teeth, carries with it, as its primary meaning, the idea of something *sharp*, *pointed;* hence *teeth*, and, in this instance, used figuratively for the sharp heads of iron bolts.

Consequently I translate, verbatim: "The doors of his facings who can force open? The circuits of his teeth are formidable."

It might be supposed that if the expression *doors* was intended to refer to the *heads* of a boiler, that the Lord would have so expressed it. But, probably, the reason for not making use of the word *heads*, instead of *doors*, was because the reader in after days would have naturally inferred that this monster had several heads, which would have greatly complicated the case, and given a most fabulous appearance to the whole description.

Moreover, one can readily perceive that this description was never intended to be literal; and that the different parts of the engine and boiler are purposely described in terms applicable also to the various parts of some powerful monster. Therefore, words of double meaning are generally used, it being left to the ingenuity of the reader to make the proper application in its proper time.

In this verse the expression "the doors of his face," has been taken to refer to the jaws of a monster, or to its mouth, from its resemblance to a door.

This interpretation of the word must be admitted to be even less plausible than the one which I have proposed. It is more likely that if *jaws* had been here meant they would have been so named.

In reference to it, Barnes says: "The idea is, that no one would dare to force open his mouth. This agrees better with the crocodile than almost any other animal. It would not apply to the whale. The crocodile is armed with a more

formidable set of teeth than almost any other animal."

Prof. Lee, however, is of contrary opinion, he says that this monster appears "as if armed in this part (his teeth) with encircling spears. The crocodile, it is true, has teeth and a mouth, which will very well suit this description. But this is also true of the whale, and particularly of that genus, which seems to be described here. Of the whale, one genus has teeth only in the lower jaw, another, in both upper and lower."

But does all this seem to explain satisfactoriiy the mystery of *the doors of his faces*, (*or facings*) which *cannot be* forced open? Who cares about forcing open the jaws of a crocodile, or of a whale? The jaws of an animal are made to open and shut; but it does not appear to be the case with the *doors* of the leviathan. They appear to be closed by most formidable circuits of teeth, (iron bolts) that they may *not* be opened. And to no creature does this apply so well as to our modern steam dragon, as I have alreadey explained.

Therefore, I translate the entire verse: "Who will force open the doors of his facings? The circuits of his teeth are formidable."

HIS STRENGTH DEPENDS ON THE EXCELLENCE OF HIS SHIELDS.

Verse 15.

גַּאֲוָה	His excellence, glory,	Corpus illius
אֲפִיקֵי	channels, or, courses	quasi scuta
מָגִנִּים	of shields	fusilia
סָגוּר	closed, shut up	compactum
חוֹתָם	with a seal	squamis se
צָר׃	tightly.	prementibus.

"His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal."

VARIOUS have been the conjectures concerning the true meaning and reference of this verse. In consequence we are confronted with a number of versions differing widely the one from the other.

The Vulgate, quoted above, has: "His body is like molten shields shut up tightly with scales pressing one upon another."

Umbreit has: "His back is of furrowed scales, shut up as with a close seal." I can see no good reason for supposing that (גַּאֲוָה) *gavah* means here *his body*, or *his back*, as rendered in the above quotations. Its primary meaning is certainly that of *pride*, *glory*, *excellence*. This

being evidently dependent on his armor of closely pressed shields. Neither can I admit that there is in the original any word which could be so construed as to show that only an idea of similitude, between this monster's scales and *molten shields* was, intended to be expressed. I claim they are represented as being indeed *shields*, or, *courses of shields*, and not *like* shields.

The supposition that the particle of similitude (כ) *caph*, should be supplied here, cannot hold good when its presence or omission is of such vast importance as it is in this instance. The late Revised English Version has: "*His* strong scales are *his* pride, shut up together *as with* a close seal." The marginal reading has—*courses of scales; channels of shields*, as explanatory of *strong scales*.

I consider these marginal readings as giving the correct meaning of the Hebrew.

But I cannot admit that the adverb *as*, should be supplemented here. The original clearly affirms that these courses of shields are closed and sealed tightly; which fact will be recognized as being of great weight in my favor.

The primary meaning of the word rendered scales, is *tubes*, according to Gesenius' Lex. But I am of the opinion that it should be *channels*, taken from the idea of a concave surface, as *a valley* which the word also means; then *tubes* as being made of many *valleys*, or *concave surfaces*. In this instance it means that the parts which constituted this monster's strength, or excellence,

were numerous shields (plates) like channels, or like many courses of shields.

If these shields were bent in the form of a channel; and were, as stated, all united together, with their convex surfaces outward, they would indeed, form a tube. From all this we must necessarily infer that the leviathan's body was tubular in shape, and covered with courses of shields all united and sealed tightly.

Is not this a most direct reference to the form and construction of our steam boiler? But this is not all. The word (סָגוֹר) *sagour* rendered *closed*, *shut up* with a seal, may have here a far more important meaning, viz., *fastened with bolts*.

Gesenius, in his lexicon, referring to the same expression made use of in the book of Joshua vi. 1, says: "It seems to refer to the gates of Jericho being *fastened with bolts*" . . . etc. Here, then, it may also be intended to indicate that these courses of shields were *fastened* to one another with *bolts*. This would complete the evidence of the nature of these shields, and, consequently, of that of this monster.

In addition to the above meaning of the words, it is an actual fact that the various courses of shields, or iron plates of our boilers, are literally sealed (calked) and pressed down with an instrument called a calker. Nothing could illustrate any better the idea conveyed here by the original word, than this close calking of the plates of our steam boilers.

Barnes, in his notes on this passage, says,

among other things, that, "there can be no doubt that there is reference to the scales of the animal, as having a resemblance to strong shields laid close to each other. But there is considerable variety of opinion as to its meaning . . . The obvious meaning is, that the pride or glory of the animal, that on which his safety depended, and which was the most remarkable thing about him, was his *scales*, which were laid together like firm and compact shields, so that nothing could penetrate them."

All commentators have remarked that there must have been something very singular about the covering of the leviathan's body. His shields are so minutely described that it is a wonder to me that some of our modern revisers were not struck with their wonderful similarity to the iron shields of our great steam boilers.

The following is the meaning of this verse: "His excellence depends on courses of shields closed up tightly with a seal."

What a comprehensive sentence; and what unexpected things it reveals to us. The wonder increases when we reflect that this was written centuries ago, when the language did not possess the technical expressions necessary to fully describe the yet undreamed-of discoveries of our days.

Here I can see plainly foretold to us that the excellence, or strength, of our modern monster, would depend on numerous courses of curved shields; and that these shields would be actually

fastened the one to the other; or, that the seams or laps of these shields would be closed up and pressed tightly together by means of an instrument here called a *seal*, and which seems to point out most directly to the *steel calker* used by machinists in our days for the very purpose of pressing tightly the edge of one plate upon the other. From these direct and most forcible expressions of the original arises also the unavoidable inference that these shields must have been of the nature of iron.

It is probably not generally known, that one of our latest inventions, in the manufacture of boilers, is a *steam riveter* which, by means of suitable dies, presses down firmly the head of a bolt as it is passed through the plates which it is intended to fasten together, rendering at the same time the seams of these plates air-tight. Now it is possible that even this late improvement is referred to here in the Hebrew word rendered *sealed tightly*, and by some, *pressed with a seal*, or a *die*.

This being the case, I think that we might as well consider out of the race the numerous contestants with which we started; such as the elephant, the hippopotamus, the crocodile and the whale. For I do not believe that any of them could stand having their skin perforated with hot iron bolts and pressed tightly by a steam die, as is literally the case with our fearless iron-skinned monster.

In all truth we can say of our modern levia-

than: "His excellence *depends on* courses of shields closed up tightly with a seal."

We may also render; "His strength *is* the excellence of *his* shields . . ."

What will unbelievers answers to this? I am anxious to hear from one, well-known, who not long ago expressed himself in about these terms: "Show me, for instance, in the Bible, a prophecy referring to our wonderful discovery of steam, *and I will believe.*"

NOT A BREATH OF AIR IS ALLOWED TO ESCAPE THROUGH HIS SHIELD.

Verse 16.

אֶחָד	One	Una
בְּאֶחָד	upon another	uni
יִגָּשׁוּ	they will drive, join	conjungitur,
וְרוּחַ	and a hissing, or, breath	et ne spiraculum
לֹא־יָבֹא	shall not cry out, or come	quidem incedit
בֵּינֵיהֶם׃	between them.	per eas.

"One is so near to another, that no air can come between them."

At first sight, this verse does not disclose the difficulties or the importance which it is found to reveal after a closer investigation.

The old English version, as well as the late revised one, has; "One is so near to another;" which, I claim, is not a strict literal rendering, or the exact sense intended to be conveyed by the original words.

By adhering closely to the construction of this sentence, it would read; "One upon another they will join." Or, according to the Chaldee (נקש) *nekash*, which means *to smite*, *to knock*; and which is kindred to the Hebrew word (נָגַשׁ) *nagas*, *to drive*, *to urge*, and which differs from the pres-

ent but in the pointing, we would have "One upon another they will smite, or knock," which, with the proper English construction would read: "They will drive, or smite one upon another." Gesenius says that the primary idea of the Hebrew here, is that of impinging. Thus the idea, that these shields, referred to in the previous verse, would be *joined*, *driven*, or *hammered down* the one upon the other by *some one*, is clearly enunciated.

Moreover the verb being in the third person plural, fut., this passage could not be properly rendered, "One is so near," nor, "One will be joined unto another." Decidedly the pronoun (הֵם) *they*, must be here expressed; and is to be understood of persons who *will join*, or *hammer together* these strong shields the one upon the other.

The construction of this passage is somewhat similar to that of the twentieth verse, fortieth chapter. "The produce of the mountains *they will bring forth unto him;*" clearly indicating, here also, that the people were to perform this act. It was natural that the idea, that the shields of this monster were to be actually driven or hammered together by somebody, should not suit the views of those who supposed that a wild animal was here meant, and that this form of expression was supposed to have been intended to denote simply the fact that one shield, or scale, lapped tightly over the other. But now that another powerful competitor is in the field, a

serious reflection and investigation of the real import of the words reveal a more probable and quite different state of things.

I am confident that it will now be quite obvious to the unprejudiced student that, direct reference is here had to shields being made fast one upon another by being joined, or hammered tightly together, and that the future tense of the verb clearly indicates that the action of driving or hammering these shields tightly one upon another, had not, at that time, been accomplished; but that it would be at some future time, and by some persons who would do so. This being the case, no further proof is required to establish the nature of the so-called leviathan, and to throw all other competitors in the shade.

How this close union between these shields was accomplished, has also been described in the previous verse, where we have seen that they were "closed up tightly with a seal;" and that his excellence, or strength, depended on this close union of these parts. All of which is astonishingly true of the iron shields covering the body (boiler) of our modern monster; and is far more easily understood, from this view of its reference, than from any which has yet been proposed of any animal known to this day.

As to the second member of this verse, it will be found to be no less extraordinary in its revelation than the first, although more easily comprehended and applied. It is generally rendered, "that no air can come between them," the shields.

The original more properly means that, not *a hiss*, or *breath*, will be allowed to come or pass between them. This is well expressed by the Vulgate, "Ne spiraculum quidem."

From the wording of this entire verse it would appear an *essential*, as well as *a remarkable* thing, in the leviathan, that his shields should be so sealed and so closely united that the least hiss, or breath of air, should not escape from between them. It seems self evident that this *hiss of air* was more likely to escape *from between* the laps of these shields than simply to *come* or *enter* through them, as some suppose. Surely we cannot imagine that such a hiss of air could enter between the compact shields of this monster, or be at all noticeable if it did; nor have any consequence worth while noticing if air did, occasionally, pass between them. Then again it would be more natural to suppose that a breath, or a particle of vapor, would be more likely to endeavor to escape *from within* this fiery monster's body, than to enter it. In this case it would seem plausible that the escaping vapor from between such tightly pressed shields would have a hissing sound, and be noticeable, specially when he was in great rage. Moreover we have authority for the supposition that such was indeed the case, and that there was within this monster's body a raging force which was, seemingly, confined in it and not allowed to escape. This I have fully demonstrated under the sixteenth verse of the preceding chapter.

If we reflect for a moment, we will certainly ask ourselves, what kind of a monster is this, which seems to be full of air or vapor, and that his strong shields should be closely pressed and sealed for the evident purpose of confining it securely within its body? Air is not supposed to pass through the hide or scales of the most vulnerable creature; why then should it be mentioned here as something possible and to be avoided with this strongly shielded leviathan? Surely there can be no allusion here to the crocodile, whose skin is porous, and whose scales cover but a part of his body. But why this evidently great force of air, vapor, or *conflicting forces* (v. 8.), confined within the body of the leviathan?

The answer is difficult, and the problem is hard to solve, especially when we try to apply it to any of the wild animals which are claimed to be referred to in this description. Yet, the problem becomes simple and easy, when one looks to our iron-shielded monster for a solution. His shields are indeed hammered the one upon the other. They are also rivetted and sealed tightly, and all this for the very purpose of preventing the least *hiss of air* or *vapor* from escaping from between them. It is also worthy of remark that, until recently, steam boilers, before leaving the hands of the makers, were always tested with compressed air, and when the least hiss of air was heard escaping from between the seams of the plates, the opening was at once hammered down and sealed, and thus, according to the

strictest construction of the original words of this verse, "They will drive, or join one upon another, that a hiss of air shall not escape from between them."

That this is the true meaning of this passage, will also be confirmed by what is said in the next verse, where it will be seen that these shields did not merely overlap each other like the scales of a fish, but that they held fast to one another, and were actually *caught together*.

In reference to these same shields we have seen, in verse thirteenth, that it is said that they cannot be stripped off, and that nothing can penetrate between the double binding, or double rivetting of the one to the other.

No one could ask for more conclusive evidence of the nature of these shields; and at no time, since the days of Job, has any one been in a better position to judge of their true reference, than we are this day.

HIS SHIELDS ARE WELDED TOGETHER.

Verse 17.

אִישׁ־	A man	Una
בְּאָחִיהוּ	to his brother	alteri
יִדְבָּקוּ	they will adhere, cleave fast,	adhærebit,
יִתְלַכְּדוּ	they will be caught together	et tenentes se
וְלֹא	and they will not	nequaquam
יִתְפָּרָדוּ׃	be separated.	separabuntur.

"They are joined one to another, they stick together that they cannot be sundered."

As you have noticed above, the literal rendering of the first part of this verse is, "A man to his brother shall adhere." A singular Hebraism to denote a strong relation or union between two or more parts. The Vulgate has: "One to the other shall adhere." Another version has: "Each is attached to its fellow." I would again call the attention of the reader to the singular fact that in this verse, as in almost all others, the verbs do not denote that the action to which they refer was an accomplished thing, but rather something which was yet to be. Every verb in this verse indicates a future action.

It is not said that the shields of this monster *adhere*, and *are caught together*, but that "they

will adhere, they will be caught together, and they will not be separated."

Taking this statement as it stands, we are forced to conclude that this creature was not then in existence but yet to come.

And as we have no record of any new species of animals, such as this, having been created since the deluge, we are left to search for this fiery and iron-shielded monster among the possible mechanical contrivances of great power which may have appeared on earth since those days. In fact we will see hereafter that Job distinctly speaks of a nation which would be *skilled in raising up the leviathan*, (chap. iii. 8.) What could have been meant by these words, if not that some *skilled* nation would, some day, *bring forth* this monster of power, would *raise him up* and cause him to become a most extraordinary one.

Why should Job say that it would be a *skilful* nation, if not to indicate that this nation, in order to be able to bring forth this leviathan, would have to be *very skilful* in the arts and sciences? Would it require a *skilful nation* to capture an alligator or a hippopotamus?

These creatures are generally found in wild marshy places, and are hunted and trapped by the most illiterate and savage people. Job does not say, a nation skilled in catching or killing him, for he has already intimated that this is impossible, but he says a nation skilful in raising him up.

Taking this word in the sense of *hatching* or *bringing forth*, we can claim the honor of *raising* thousands of leviathans every year.

It seems evident from the full and minute description given of this monster's shields that they must have constituted one of the principal and most wonderful features of his body. Here we are told that they will cleave fast to one other, and be caught together, so much so that they cannot be torn asunder. Moreover you will find in the original that the word rendered, *will cleave fast;* has, as a noun, a still more wonderful meaning to us, that of a *soldering* or *welding* of metals. Therefore we may understand this passage to mean, *one to its fellow shall be welded;* and such I consider its real import to be.

According to this the evidence in favor of my views would be complete. These shield are of iron, they are fastened together with iron bolts (teeth). They are sealed tightly that no vapor may escape from between them; they are even *welded together* that they may not be sundered.

Could one ask for better evidence?

It is minute and circumstantial, not presumptive. Moreover, just such a monster as the above is before the bar this very day, clad in all the raiments of behemoth and leviathan, and the impartial judge can decide whether they really belong to him or not. But who will now presume to take them away from him? He holds them fast and will not let them go; and I will defend his rightful claim to them.

HIS SNEEZINGS WILL BE LIT UP WITH BRIGHTNESS

Verse 18.

עֲטִישָׁתָיו	His sneezings, or, belchings	Sternutatio
תָּהֵל	will cause to shine	ejus
אוֹר	a light,	splendor ignis,
וְעֵינָיו	and his eyes *will be*	et oculi ejus
כְּעַפְעַפֵּי־	as the eyelashes	ut palpebræ
שָׁחַר׃	of the morning.	diluculi.

"By his neesings a light doth shine, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning."

The first member of this verse seems to me susceptible of two different renderings, on account of the possibility of the root of the word having been either (הָלַל) *halal*, *to shine;* or (חָלַל) *chalal*, *to pierce*, *to pollute*. Either of these meanings will be found to agree with the facts in the case here alluded to.

Taking the word in the sense of *to shine*, we would have: "His sneezings will cause a light to shine," or, according to the Septuagint, "In his sneezings light shineth forth." We will hereafter notice that the latter rendering contains the true idea; for it is not these sneezings which *cause* this light to shine.

Taken in the sense of *to pollute*, *to obscure*, it would mean: "His sneezings will obscure the light." The first would indicate that, when he expelled his breath, or the vapors confined in his body, it caused a light to shine. Many suppose that this refers to the crocodile *when* he sneezes. But, really, such a supposition is ridiculous. Where is there any good authority to support such an assertion?

Who has ever seen a light produced by the sneezing of a crocodile? And those who may have heard him make some strange noise, are they sure that it might be called sneezing? Were they close enough to see the light?

Prof. Lee, in reference to the supposed light emitted *when* the crocodile sneezes, says that he can find but one account from Aristotle, in which the crocodile is said to sneeze, but not one telling us that this gives out a light, or anything like it.

Barnes, in explanation, says: "Amphibious animals, the longer they hold their breath under water, respire so much the more violently when they emerge, and the breath is expelled suddenly and with violence." All this may be of animals in general. But is it so in particular, and in a remarkable degree, of any animal which has been shown to fulfill all the requisites of this description? Barnes does not assert that the breath of any of these amphibious animals emits light, which seems to be the very thing accounted as wonderful and strange in the leviathan. Then

would a mere phosphorescence be alluded to here in such glowing terms? It must certainly be intended to refer to something extraordinary, in the way of light, a great emission of light every time he exhales, or belches.

And here, who will not, at once, be struck with the remarkable application of these sneezings and luminous vapors, to the numerous violent belchings and puffings of a steam locomotive? Our monster emits at each stroke of the piston, a volume of the vapors confined within him. These, at times, carry with them, flashes of light which are magnified by being diffused through the volume of white vapor which ascends. Under these circumstances his sneezings assume the appearance of a luminous cloud bursting forth from his throat. Are the supposed sneezings of the crocodile comparable to this? Are they worthy of such poetic language?

I have stated that this passage might also have the meaning of—"His sneezings will obscure the light." This would seem to imply a contradiction. It is, evidently, the reverse of its unanimously adopted meaning. Nevertheless I contend that both renderings are quite applicable to *my* leviathan.

Who, indeed, does not witness every day the clouds of thick and black smoke which he pours forth, as by violent sneezings, from his smoke stack, and which literally *obscure* the light? Could anything be more literally true, and more poetically expressed? Yes, our locomotive sneezes ter-

rifically, and yet none of us knew it before. But Job knew it and heard it 3500 years ago.

Having thus explained the meaning and reference of this passage, I would now propose a change in the construction which has, generally, been adopted in our translations. The expression, "His sneezings," has been taken to be the subject of the verb *to shine;* the former is in the plural, whilst the latter is in the singular. I consider that the word *light* is here intended as the subject of the verb, consequently I render: "A light will cause his sneezings to shine."

In explanation of this, I would call attention to the fact just referred to above, and which can be often and readily witnessed during the day, but more distinctly when it is dark, that under certain circumstances, whilst a locomotive is puffing hard, all at once a volume of light pervades the whole mass of vapors around his head, forming a beautiful luminous cloud above. This is, undoubtedly, the fact adverted to here. This being the case, you will notice that it is not the puffing nor the vapors which are *the cause* of this light shining, but that it is *a light*, or *a flame*, entering the throat of the stack, which causes these vaporous sneezings to shine. Now if we revert to the original Hebrew, we will find, singularly enough, that *the facts* in this case with our locomotive have lead us to correct a mistake in our translations; and this is not the only instance of the kind.

Let us now see what can be meant by the

second member of this verse, which is rendered: "His eyes are like the eyelids of the morning."

Surely the friends of the crocodile, and of "id omne genus," will rejoice to see my iron-shielded monster evidently cornered here, for he has no eyes.

So far he has not been found wanting in anything called for by these twenty-seven consecutive verses; and this is certainly more than can be said of any or of all of his opponents put together.

I am confident that I will find in him *eyes* that will answer for all that is called for in this passage. We are not told that he can see with these eyes, but simply that "his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning." As much could be said, in a figurative sense, of any inanimate thing having about its head large globes emitting rays of light like the rising sun.

And it is undoubtedly in this figurative sense—which has been the one made use of throughout this description—that we are to view these eyes of the leviathan; they are not like the *eyes* of any other creature, but they are *like the eyelids of the morning*.

If we can ascertain to what *the eyelids of the morning* refer, we will then have an idea of the appearance of these eyes of the leviathan.

In reference to this, Barnes says: "The 'eyelids of the morning' is a beautiful poetic phrase quite common in Hebrew poetry."

Gesenius says that "the poetic allusion is specially to *the eyelashes*, as a figure to represent the first rays of dawn."

Then these *eyelids*, or rather, *eyelashes*, represent the *rays* of the morning sun. So that the peculiarity of these *eyes* was, that they emitted rays of light similar to the rays that precede the rising of the sun.

Certainly nothing like this can be claimed for the dim light of the eyes of the crocodile.

But let us behold in the distance, during a dark night, the approaching engine.

His tremendous head-lights flash lightnings on all sides. The earth fairly shines before him as it does before the rising sun. His path is fast lit up in advance by the flashing rays of these searching eyes whose quivering lids seem to expand as they approach, spreading awe and terror among the beasts of the forests and of the fields, even inspiring man with a sense of dread at his fearless and majestic looks.

Yes, indeed, our leviathan has a most beautiful eye, and flashes of light proceed from it like unto the rays of the rising sun.

This is surely a strange exhumation of a wonderful and long-lost mastodon. We have found his eyes with their full primitive brightness, and have just discovered that he sneezes terrifically. Here, indeed, is what the great Seer, Job, said of him: "A light will cause his sneezings to shine and his eyes will be as the eyelashes of the morning."

SPARKS OF FIRE LEAP FORTH FROM HIS MOUTH.

Verse 19.

מִפִּיו	From his mouth	De ore ejus
לַפִּידִים	flames, or, flaming torches	lampades
יְהַלָּכוּ	will leap forth,	procedunt,
כִּירוּדֵי	sparks	sicut tedæ
אֵשׁ	of fire, or, glowing sparks	ignis
יִתְמַלָּטוּ׃	will slip themselves away.	accensæ.

"Out of his mouth go burning lamps, and sparks of fire leap out."

THE reading of the Vulgate, as you notice above, would lead us to suppose that the original did not refer to real flames, and sparks of fire; but that all this was spoken of figuratively, and that really it was only something *resembling* flames and glowing sparks which was emitted from the mouth of this monster. Therefore, I would call your attention to the fact that the particle of similitude (כ) *caph*, *as*, does not appear in the original; neither can I grant that it necessarily requires to be supplied.

I accept the statement as it stands, and render: "Out of his mouth will leap forth flaming torches, *and* glowing sparks will slip themselves away."

As you will notice, these flaming torches and glowing sparks are not said to proceed from this creature's nostrils, but from *his mouth.* Consequently, the argument of those who suppose that certain animals are here referred to, because from their *nostrils* proceeds at times a hot and inflamed breath, cannot hold good. For it is distinctly mentioned that these flames and sparks of fire come from his mouth. Very few animals breathe through their mouth. But the leviathan seems to do so with a terror.

I consider the word *mouth* as being here only a poetic expression, and may refer to any aperture serving the purposes of a mouth, either to inhale or exhale.

In this sense we often say "the mouth of a gun." This case is almost identical with the one referred to in this verse, viz., a large opening through which pour forth fire and smoke; the smoke-stack.

To those who might object to taking the word *mouth* in a poetic or figurative sense, and then to giving a literal meaning to the words rendered flames and sparks of fire, I would say that the original word has the meaning of *mouth*, *aperture*, *orifice*, or *large opening*. All of which can be applied to animate as well as to inanimate things. Umbreit renders, *jaws;* others, *his throat.* The writings of our greatest authors are filled with poetic and figurative expressions. Yet one would be considered demented who would insist on interpreting their entire works either literally or figuratively. "In medio stat virtus."

The plan of this description seems to be this. To various parts and peculiarities of a complicated piece of mechanism, are given, in a poetic way, the names common to some similar parts or attributes found in animals. Its bars of iron, which constitute its frame-work, are represented as the bones which constitute the main structure of an animal, therefore it is said "its bones are bars of iron." Its numerous iron shields are likened to the impenetrable scales of some aquatic monster. A tubular boiler, which is its vital part, becomes its body.

It has a large flue, or opening, through which it pours forth smoke, flames and glowing sparks of fire, as described here, and this opening is likened to the *mouth* of a dragon. It pours out of its mouth real flames and sparks of fire; but as there is nothing in animals to which these can be likened, they are plainly mentioned as being *real*, and not *like* sparks, or like anything else. His *head-lights* can be likened to the *eyes* of a monster, and you find them represented as such. He possesses a terribly destructive power, and this we find designated by a *sword*, the recogized emblem of destruction. His body is filled with boiling water; but as there is nothing in animals to which it could be intelligibly likened, it is indicated by the vapors of a boiling pot issuing from his nostrils, as we will see in the next verse. He, at times, has a very long and extended tail, made up of various parts linked the one to the other. On account of this

he is likened to an enormous serpent. As he is full of fire and runs swiftly, he is very appropriately called *a fiery flying serpent.* Yea, it is he, the linked monster of Job.

It is evident that it was the intention of the Lord who revealed this, to leave it to our ingenuity to find out, in its proper time, to what it all referred. You have already seized the meaning and reference of this beautiful verse.

Indeed, how often have you not witnessed the *flaming torches* and *glowing sparks of fire* leaping forth from the throat of the engine as he speeds on like a flaming meteor, or monster dragon, emitting "unquenchable fire" from his throat, and hot vapors from his angry nostrils.

The reader can fully realize how strikingly the following words of Job apply to our own fiery monster: "Out of his mouth will leap forth flaming torches, and glowing sparks will slip themselves away."

You will notice how accurately are described, in the last part of this verse, the escaping sparks from an engine. They are represented as silently and hurriedly *slipping themselves away* from their place of confinement. Can those who, so far, may have doubted of the reference of this description, refuse here to acknowledge this irrefutable evidence of the nature of this monster? Can their imagination furnish another monster that can fulfill, so literally, the extraordinary things here alluded to?

Yet, it is so strange, so unexpected, and so

incomprehensible to some, that a steam locomotive should have been described in the Bible so long ago, that they *will not* see these *flaming sparks*, although they blow in their eyes every day from the very throat of the leviathan himself.

But, such men, though, can see clearly just such flaming and glowing sparks escaping from the mouth of a crocodile, or from that of some fiery antediluvian mastodon which, unluckily, was never seen, except in their own imagination, where it was born.

Let no one lose sight of the original, and grasp at a shadow.

HOT VAPORS WILL ISSUE FORTH FROM HIS NOSTRILS.

Verse 20.

מִנְּחִירָיו	From his nostrils	De naribus ejus
יֵצֵא	will go forth	procedit
עָשָׁן	smoke	fumus
כְּרְוֹד	as *from* a kettle	sicut ollæ
נָפוּחַ	boiling	succensæ
וְאֲגָמִן׃	or a heated caldron.	atque ferventis.

"Out of his nostrils goeth smoke, as out of a seething pot or caldron."

This is, undoubtedly, one of the most extraordinary and important verses of this description. The fact cannot be avoided that the generation of steam by means of a heated caldron, is alluded to. Another singular fact is, that the Septuagint clearly state that the fire was made with anthracite, (coal).

There is no essential difference between the various renderings of this verse. All agree that, from the nostrils of the leviathan went forth smoke similar to that which issues from a boiling kettle, or caldron.

The Vulgate renders: "Out of his nostrils goes forth smoke as of a kettle heated and boiling."

A Revised English version has: "From his

nostrils goes forth smoke, like a kettle with kindled reeds."

There is but one word in this verse which, on account of its ambiguity, has caused translators and commentators to differ. It is (אַגְמֹן) *agemon*, which means *a heated caldron*, and also *a reed*, etc., as explained in a previous verse. On account of the different meanings of this word, this verse is susceptible of being rendered: "From his nostrils will go forth smoke as from a boiling pot ablaze with reeds, or, as from a boiling pot or heated caldron."

Still its most literal rendering, as well as its most appropriate meaning, would appear to be the following: "From his nostrils will go forth smoke as from a boiling kettle and reed;" that is, a boiling kettle having to it a hollow reed or *spout*.

The idea intended to be conveyed here would seem to be that, steam would issue from the nostrils of this monster as from the spout of a boiling kettle.

We have seen in the previous verse that the word *mouth* was made use of, in a figurative sense, to denote a large opening through which escaped flames and sparks of fire; and that this aperture corresponded exactly to the one in the smoke-stack of an engine, through which often escapes flaming torches, and a volume of glowing sparks.

Now we are told that this monster had *nostrils*.

Undoubtedly here, as in the previous verse, these *nostrils* must be taken in a figurative sense, and as referring to certain apertures which seemed to

answer the purpose of nostrils, viz., openings through which one's breath can escape.

There are mainly two such nostrils, or openings, in a locomotive, viz., the two pipes which carry off the exhaust steam from the steam cylinders. This exhaust takes place after each stroke of the piston. Consequently, when an engine is working, a continual exhaling of steam takes place through these exhaust pipes. Nothing could be more appropriately called the nostrils of an engine, when the purpose they answer is taken into consideration. Taking the two steam chests as the lungs of this creature, we have a continual breathing or inhaling and exhaling of vapor taking place through these mechanical lungs; and the exhaust vapor escaping through its natural outlets, just as it occurs in the animal system.

Here then we find, very unexpectedly, a beautiful and very appropriate comparison of these artificial parts of the engine, to the breathing organs of a living creature.

But this is not all. Job informs us also that through these nostrils *will escape smoke as from a kettle heated and boiling*, or, as from the spout of a boiling kettle. Is not this a most direct and astonishing reference to steam. What is the smoke which issues from a *kettle heated and boiling*, if not *steam?*

Here also we find a direct allusion to a steam boiler. Really this was all that was wanting to confirm the views I have entertained all along, that this description referred to our modern iron-clad steam monster.

Some may insist that these vapors are only likened to those which issue from a boiling kettle. Therefore it may be well to call the reader's attention to the fact that, there exists, in the original, no such comparison; but the plain statement that smoke came from the leviathan's nostrils *as from* the spout of *a boiling kettle.* Not only can we infer from this that it was steam, but also, that it issued from this monster's nostrils through some pipes resembling the spout of a kettle. Very likely an allusion is here made to the exhaust pipes.

We can now fully realize that the power which was said to be located inside of this monster's flank (chap. xl. 16) must, indeed, have been steam; that same destructive power which is represented by a sword, and which is to be applied to it by the one who makes him. Evidently it is also the same force which *spreads him asunder* when his confidence is deceived, as we have seen under verse the ninth.

There is but one thing more required to complete the evidence. It is the proof that this steam was not the exhaled vapors from the body of an animal, but was generated by fire.

And this proof will be found in the next verse, where there is most positive evidence of a glowing fire of coals being constantly kept up by drafts of air.

The Septuagint, in their rendering of the verse under consideration, give *furnace* instead *boiling caldron;* and what is more extraordinary, add, that the fire was made of anthracite, (coal).

They render the entire verse as follows: "From his nostrils pours forth smoke of a furnace heated with a fire of coals." Another singular fact in this rendering is, that they do not say that this smoke was *like* the smoke of a furnace, but they directly assert that the smoke, which came from the nostrils of this monster, was *actually* the smoke from a furnace or caldron heated with coals.

This confirms me in my opinion that the writers of the Septuagint were fully aware that this description applied to some mechanical contrivance, and not to any living animal. Otherwise they would not have asserted here that the smoke from a furnace, heated with a fire of coals, passed through his nostrils. Surely this is an important and astonishing verse.

No more conclusive evidence in favor of my views could be expected. Now when we behold our raging steed approaching with distended nostrils and angry breath, we will realize the full force and reference of these words of Job; "Out of his nostrils will issue forth smoke as out of a pot or caldron."

HIS INHALINGS GIVE LIFE TO BURNING COALS.

Verse 21.

נַפְשׁוֹ	His inhaling (breath)	Halitus ejus
גֶּחָלִים	burning coals	prunas
תְּלַהֵט	will vivify, will kindle ;	ardere facit ;
וְלַהַב	and a flame	et flamma
מִפִּיו	from his mouth	de ore ejus
יֵצֵא׃	will leap out.	egreditur.

"His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goes out of his mouth."

With the exception of the Septuagint, most versions render the first word of this verse by *his breath.* But it has also the meaning of *inhaling;* and there are many reasons, as will be seen hereafter, for supposing that this is the sense in which it is intended here. I consider also that the word rendered *to kindle*, has a more appropriate meaning in this instance, which is *to vivify*, *to enliven.*

There is quite a difference between *kindling a fire*, and vivifying or enlivening it with the breath after it is kindled. In the first instance it is an impossibility. No one's breath can *kindle* or *set fire* to coals. But it is possible to add life to, or vivify coals already kindled, by blowing on

them. Evidently this is the distinction to be made here. Therefore I render: "His inhaling will vivify burning coals."

As to the supposed reference of this passage to an animal, I would say that I am not aware that any of our great scientific investigators or naturalists have, as yet, discovered any animal whose breath had the power of causing coals to glow with flames.

It is well understood that the air exhaled from the lungs of any living creature, has lost its oxygen, the very principle of life of the fire, and consequently could not, as here interpreted, set coals on fire.

What kind of a creature, then, is this? And why should it have any occasion to set coals on fire? Surely it must be a fiery dragon; even a flame leaps from his mouth.

Commentators, in general, are very reticent about the meaning and reference of this important passage. All that Barnes ventures to say about it is: "It seems to be a flame, and to set on fire all around it."

Prof. Lee supposes that the expression here may be intended to convey an idea of the fiery character of his disposition. But the reader will at once notice that this does not explain the appearance here of these *coals of fire*. It is not only to be inferred from the words of this passage that now and then a flame escapes from his mouth, but it must be noticed and accounted for that his actual *breath*, or *inhaling*, "kindleth coals."

There are very few wild animals that will not flee from fire. But it would seem that this one even consumed coals of fire.

The Septuagint goes still further than this, for it says that its very soul, its very life is burning coals—"Η ψυκη αυτου ανθρακες."

Really, this creature would seem to be the ancient Chimera whose breathing was unquenchable fire.

The reader will take particular notice that the direct meaning of the original cannot be explained away, in this instance, by saying that *probably* it means that his breath was *like* coals of fire; for the original is most emphatic and clear, and can leave no doubt that, by some means or other, the monster here referred to, made use of his inhalings to vivify burning coals of fire.

It is useless for commentators to try to tone this passage down to suit their views of its reference. They can afford no satisfactory explanation when they apply it to any known animal.

To the well-known saying that, where there is so much smoke there must be some fire; I would add, that, where there is so much fire and raging flames there cannot be much animal life.

This extraordinary passage suits, in a most remarkable manner, the habits of our American leviathan—the locomotive.

Its *inhalings* are the drafts of air which, in passing through the furnace, *vivify its burning coals.* This draft is as essential to it as it is to our common fire-places. The draft of the loco-

motive was an ingenious discovery. It is caused by the exhausted steam from the cylinders being made to rush through the centre of the smoke-stack, and thus, carrying with it, not only a volume of air and smoke, but often the very flames from the furnace. And this latter fact is undoubtedly what is adverted to in the second member of this verse, "a flame issues forth from its mouth."

They who suppose that this entire description should apply, literally, to some animal, will find in this, and in the two preceding verses, a fair field for displaying their knowledge and talent, by discovery or pointing out to us any animal, known to have existed upon this earth, to which these verses can be applied literally.

On the other hand they will soon discover that, so far, its most direct and literal application is to our modern iron monster, full of flames and coals of fire which he indeed keeps ablaze by the inhaling of his breath.

Let those who will not believe deny, if possible, the fact that, our locomotive fulfills, in a most literal and poetic sense, all the requirements of the above verses. I will repeat them here:

"Out of his mouth will leap forth flaming torches, and glowing sparks will scatter themselves along."

"From his nostrils will issue forth smoke as from a boiling pot or caldron."

"His inhaling will vivify burning coals, and a flame will leap forth from his mouth."

DESOLATE PLACES WILL REJOICE AT HIS PRESENCE.

Verse 22.

בְצַוָּארוֹ	Within his neck	In collo ejus
יָלִין	will abide	morabitur
עֹז	might, or strength,	fortitudo
וְלִפָנָיו	and at his presence	et faciem ejus
תַּרוֹן	shall rejoice, dance *with joy*	præcedit
דְּאָבָה׃	a desolation, want.	egestas.

"In his neck remaineth strength, and sorrow is turned into joy before him."

It is only in its application to the steam engine that we can realize the full force and the rich conception of genius contained in this verse. I find its true meaning to be this: "Might will abide within his neck, and a desolation shall dance with joy at his presence."

Could the ideas contained in this verse be more poetically expressed. Might and power are represented as having established their dwelling within his neck. That is to say, that he alone, among all other contrivances of power, possesses the greatest and most practical principles of power; they naturally dwell within him.

To what an eminent degree this is true of the

steam engine, can only be fully appreciated when we have had, (1) an opportunity of realizing what a tremendous power steam can exert. (2) When we have calculated the enormous amount of work it has accomplished within its brief career; and the herculean tasks it performs each day.

It is estimated that, in the United States, the force equivalent to the working steam engines is seven millions five hundred thousand horse-power. In England, seven millions horse-power. In Germany, four and a half millions. In France, over three millions. In Austria, a million and a half. To this must be added the motive power of the locomotives, which is estimated to be three millions horse-power. This alone gives us the enormous total of twenty-six millions horse-power.

It is estimated that the number of locomotives, in all the world, is one hundred and five thousand. And all these figures are constantly increasing. Was there ever a creature on earth, whose power and importance could be at all compared with those of steam? Indeed of him alone could it have been said, "He is king over all conceptions of power," and, "might hath its dwelling within his neck."

The second member of this verse, which is rendered, "Sorrow is turned into joy before him;" has suffered a great deal at the hands of commentators. It may be rendered, "Desolation fleeth at his presence, or, a desolate place rejoiceth, or danceth with joy, at his presence."

How grand and sublime this divine conception

appears, when its birth is traced to the powerful influence of our fleet-footed giant in changing a wilderness into a place of rejoicing abundance. Is there want or distress in a desolated place—there the engine, with giant strides, carries abundance of provisions and help, and virtually causes those who were in want and distress to dance and rejoice at his presence. He causes the very deserts and rocks to be inhabited; and wild and distant lands to rejoice and bloom with vegetation.

Villages and large cities spring up, as if by enchantment, from each of his footsteps. His arms are extended to all nations alike; and he causes want and distress to flee from before him.

The reader can well understand how difficult it was for expositors to reconcile these wonderful attributes with their preconceived notions of the reference of this description to a most terrible and ferocious wild monster, for he would be more likely to spread terror and devastation wherever he passed, than to cause rejoicings at his presence.

Consequently most writers looked upon the word rendered *to flee*, *to dance*, as meaning to flee or to dance through fear, instead of *want fleeth from before him*, or, *a desolation rejoiceth at his presence*. The latter is the meaning which I consider is intended in this instance. It is the meaning given to it in old English versions, but not followed in the last Revised Edition, which has, "Terror danceth before him."

The Vulgate has, "Want goeth before his face." Barnes says, "The sense is, that 'terror

dances before him' . . . as if terror played or pranced along wherever he came." This could be easily construed to apply to the terror which the locomotive inspires in all wild animals, but it is certainly not the meaning of the original.

All can now recognize the propriety and beauty of this passage, when applied to our monster of power, and to his great capacities for causing a desolate place to rejoice, and want to flee at his presence.

To what other can these words be applied with more propriety?

Indeed, "Might hath its dwelling within his neck, and a desolation shall dance *with joy* at his presence."

HIS MEMBERS ARE SEPARABLE.

Verse 23.

מִפְלֵי	The detachable, or separable parts	Membra
בְשָׂרוֹ	of his body, flesh	carnium ejus
דָּבֵקוּ	are joined, connected together;	cohærentia sibi;
יָצוּק	it will cleave fast, be cast	mittet contra
עָלָיו	upon him;	eum fulmina,
בַּל־	nothing	et ad locum
יִמּוֹט׃	will be loose, or, shaky.	alium non ferentur.

"The flakes of his flesh are joined together; they are firm in themselves; they cannot be moved."

This verse has proved a puzzle to all those who have labored to apply it either to the crocodile or to the whale.

If the original were to be understood as alluding to the flakes of his flesh, as the above rendering has it, these flakes would then have to be considered as the scales or shields of this monster's body. But, evidently, these cannot be meant, as in that sense, this verse would become an exact repetition of what has already been said, in verse seventeenth, concerning these shields, viz., "One will cleave fast unto another, they will be united together that they cannot be sundered." In view

of this, it is to be presumed that the words of this verse could not have been intended to refer to the scales or shields of the leviathan, but to other parts adhering to his flesh. By the word *flesh* may be understood the exterior covering of his body; or it may be intended to indicate that it was not his internal parts which were here meant, but some exterior ones, those made fast to his flesh.

Albert Barnes, in reference to the first word of this verse, says: "The Hebrew word here used means anything *falling*, or *pendulous*, and the reference here is, probably, to the pendulous parts of the flesh of the animal; the flabby parts; the dew-laps. In animals commonly those parts about the neck and belly are soft, pendulous, and contribute little to their strength. The meaning here is, that in the leviathan, instead of being thus flabby and pendulous, they were compact and firm. This is strikingly true of the crocodile."

I cannot admit this to be the correct meaning of the word in this instance. Neither can this passage be properly applied to the crocodile.

If the word under consideration (מַפָּל) refers to the *pendulous and flabby parts* of the leviathan's flesh, then there is an evident contradiction between the two members of this verse, as now applied; for in the second hemistich it is said that all is made fast to him, so much so that nothing will be *loose* nor *shaky*.

In the face of this, how could those parts be said to be *pendulous and flabby?*

If they are said to be such, how can they, according to the above author's own words, be intended to mean that "they were compact and firm"? And how can he apply these words to the crocodile, when he admits that there is no part of his flesh which exhibits any of these characteristics?

If this passage refers to the flesh or skin of an animal, it is difficult to understand how it can be said that nothing about it can move or shake. In the other sense of these words, I can repeat with Prof. Lee: "Is it not absurb to say that the lax and pendulous flesh of any animal is hard and immovable, as our text here manifestly does?"

The only inference to be drawn from this is that the original words have not been given their intended meaning.

Some render "the flakes of his flesh." Others "the muscles of his flesh." The Vulgate has: "the members of his flesh." The Septuagint render it: "the fleshy parts of his body."

It seems to me as though the self-evident meaning of this passage had been purposely ignored. Why should not these so-called pendulous and movable parts refer to his limbs, to those parts which move when he is in action, the members of his flesh, as the Vulgate has rendered it?

Some of these limbs might have had a pendulous appearance, as though they were merely hung or fastened to his sides. They might have

been formed of two or more parts connected by suitable joints, as the original words indicate. Yet they were so perfectly made and adjusted that *nothing was shaky or loose* about them.

This would certainly solve the problem without any glaring contradictions.

But, possibly, it is because the friends of the crocodile did not dare to expose his miserable crooked paws, that they did not take this, at least, plausible view of the reference of this passage.

Yet I am not satisfied that the word (מַפָּל) *mappal* is intended here in the sense of *pendulous*, *flabby;* as most exponents of this passage have rendered it. I find in it a more wonderful disclosure in its primary meaning of something *falling*, *falling off*, or *away;* that is something *separable*, *detachable;* for such is, indeed, the real meaning of the word. No where else do I find it used in the sense of *pendulous*, or *flabby*.

In its connection and form, the word would refer, here, to parts or members of this monster's body which were, evidently, *detachable*, *removable*.

Now the reference of these *detachable parts*, or *members*, to what is properly called *the engine*, seems so evident to me, that I believe it will not require much explanation to cause it all to be fully understood and appreciated.

In fact what is *the engine*, but a combination of *separable* and *detachable* parts.

Taken as a whole, the steam engine is a compound machine, composed of different parts, spe-

cially of a boiler and an engine. Taken separately, the *engine* refers to a set of suitable and detachable mechanical devices, all connected together, and set in motion by the pressure of steam from the boiler.

Engines are of various kinds, and differently applied. Those made for stationary boilers, are often located far from the boiler itself. The engine of a movable steam machine, is generally *made fast*, or *cast* to the boiler. Such is the case with the locomotive; and undoubtedly, this is what is here meant by, "it will be made fast (or cast) upon him." All its parts are securely fastened together; and such is said to be the case with those of the leviathan. They are also made fast to the exterior parts of the boiler, and become thereby, really "the members of his flesh," as rendered by the Vulgate. By means of these mechanical devices the locomotive propels himself; consequently they are to him as *his limbs*, *his members*. None of these are allowed to become *loose* or *shaky*, and Job reminds us of this fact, when he says: "Nothing will be loose (or shaky)."

If we trace the meaning of the primary or kindred roots (פל) *phal*, and (פָּלָא) *phala*, we will find that the word *mappal* may also have here the meaning of *wonderful*, *marvellous;* this might refer to some parts of this monster's body, in the sense of (מִפְלָאוֹת) wondrous and marvellous works. And as the meaning of the word rendered *flesh*, is also *beauty;* we may very appropriately render this

passage by, "The marvellous parts of his beauty are connected together." This would seem to answer exactly to the promise made in the twelfth verse, viz., "I will not pass in silence his members . . . nor *the beauty of his equipment.*"

Then again this *marvellous beauty*, as a distinct thing from the body of this monster, may be exactly that which is referred to in the second hemistich, by: "It will be made fast upon him," which would account for the verb being in the singular. This would give to this verse another unexpected meaning; and one which would suit, to an eminent degree, the wonderful and marvellous beauty and perfection of an engine, considered separately from the boiler. Its numerous and intricate parts are masterpieces of beauty and workmanship.

Nothing about it is allowed to be *loose* or *shaky*. Here will be appreciated the force of the rendering of the French version: "Tout est massif en lui, rien n'y branle"—all about him is solid, nothing is shaky.

I am at a loss to understand how the Vulgate arrived at its extraordinary rendering of the second member of this verse.

Instead of "it (or, all) will be made fast upon him; nothing will be loose." It has, "He will send lightnings against him, and they, (his members) will not be carried to another place." This is as much as to say that, even the thunderbolts from above could not kill him, nor move his members from their place.

This is a conception not inferior to any in this description, and quite applicable to our ponderous iron monster, who fears nothing, not even the thunderbolts from above; and whose strong members and sinews even the lightning could not paralyze.

But, undoubtedly, the true meaning of this most extraordinary verse is: "The separable parts of his flesh are connected together; *all* will be made fast to him; nothing will be shaky."

What a wonderful verse this proves to be, when we come to realize that here is, evidently, mentioned the fact that the various parts of the engine are detachable; and consequently, removable from the main body of the locomotive. Can any one convince himself that it is possible that such a description may refer to some *unknown* animal?

Surely, the serious student will not find any thing *doubtful* concerning this great prophecy, nor its reference. What a marvellous thing for us, who are prone to ask for evidence, to behold now before our own eyes, the most tangible and most astounding fulfilment of one of the oldest and most complete prophecies in the world. There is nothing at all comparable to it in the whole Bible.

HE HAS NEITHER HEART NOR FEELINGS.

Verse 24.

לִבּוֹ	His heart	Cor ejus
יָצוּק	will be indurated	indurabitur
כְּמוֹ־אָבֶן	similar to a stone,	tanquam lapis,
וְיָצוּק	and will be firm	et stringetur
כְּפֶלַח	as a piece	quasi malleatoris
תַּחְתִּית׃	of the lower *rocks*.	incus.

"His heart is as firm as a stone; yea, as hard as a piece of the nether millstone."

At first sight, it would seem as though the leviathan was here represented as having a heart. But it soon becomes evident that the word *heart* must be intended here in a figurative sense to denote his nature, or the *quality* of his natural attributes, and not a physical and sensitive heart. Had the real fleshy heart of an animal been intended, it would not have been so positively asserted and repeated that it was *indurated* similar to a stone, yea, *even as firm and as solid as the lower rocks*. We may admit, that to say one's heart is as hard as a stone, is to mean, generally, that one has no feelings; yet not implying that he has no heart at all. But in an exceptional case as this, and when it is so em-

phatically maintained that his heart is as hard and as solid as the lower rocks or the nether millstone, it must be inferred that, whatever may be intended, must have neither feelings nor sensitiveness; in fact must be made of something *very hard* and *solid.*

In connection with the locomotive, this comparison to *rocks* and *stones* is quite significant, when we reflect on the nature of iron ores, out of which our monster's heart and hide are made. Then it would be well to remark that this monster's heart is not said to have been so at that time, but that it would be made so at some future time. Vulgate, indurabitur . . . . et stringetur. One can easily perceive how well the above can be said of a locomotive. He has no heart whatever; neither has he any feelings. He will crush to pieces anything that may be in his way. He takes pity on no one, for he has no more feelings than a stone. All your prayers, supplications and kindness, would be of no avail; they would not be any more apt to make an impression on him than they would be likely to make on a millstone or an anvil. If you thought of chastising him, all the blows that you might strike on his back, would have no more effect than if struck on a rock. Such I consider to be the meaning and reference of this verse.

As to the word rendered *the nether millstone*, I am of the opinion that it is intended to denote rather the lower strata of rocks, as they are the most immovable and, generally, the most firm and

compact. The Vulgate and the Septuagint render anvil.

As to the meaning of this passage Albert Barnes says: "Bochart remarks that the word *heart* here is not to be regarded as denoting the *courage* of the animal, as it sometimes does, but the heart literally. There is peculiar firmness or strength needed in the *hearts* of all animals, to enable them to propel the blood through the arteries of the body; and in an animal of the size of a crocodile, it is easy to see that the heart must be capable of exerting vast force. But there is no reason to suppose that the affirmation here is made on the supposition that there is need of extraordinary strength in the heart to propel the blood. The presumption therefore is, that the statement here is based on what had been seen of the remarkable compactness and firmness of the heart of the animal here referred to. Probably there was nothing so peculiar in the heart of the crocodile that this description would be applicable to that animal alone, but it is such doubtless as would apply to the heart of any animal of extraordinary size and strength."

All that I can conclude from the above remarks is, that the writer admits that there is nothing so peculiar in the heart of the crocodile that it could be claimed to be the one alluded to in the words of this verse.

But what is very peculiar of our modern leviathan is, that his heart, figuratively speaking, is as indurated as a stone, and that he has no more

feelings than an anvil, or a piece of the lower rocks; which is exactly the requirements of the text.

A heart that is as hard as a stone, and as firm and solid as an anvil, can have none of the essential requisites of a heart, in its literal acceptation; it is, consequently, equivalent to having no such heart at all.

This monster, then, must have had no heart, no feelings. Such is the peculiarity of our wonderful dragon.

Here then I would render: "His heart will be indurated similar to a stone, and will be firm as a piece of the lower rocks."

WHEN GOING AT FULL RAGE HE MAY MISS HIS TRACK.

Verse 25.

מִשֶּׁתּוֹ	At his boiling up, raging	Cum sublatus fuerit
יָגוּרוּ	they will fear	timebunt
אֵילִים	the most courageous,	angeli,
מִשְּׁבָרִים	*lest* from breakings, (accidents)	et territi
יִתְחַטָּאוּ	they lose themselves, miss their way.	purgabuntur.

"When he raiseth up himself, the mighty are afraid, by reason of breakings they purify themselves."

It would puzzle the most learned to tell us what is meant by either the Latin or English versions quoted above. "When he will have been raised up," says the Vulgate, "the angels will fear, and, terrified, they will be purified."

Does this mean that this leviathan will, some day, attempt to scale the high heavens, and thereby create a great consternation among the angels? Surely Bochart could not claim such high honors for *his crocodile*. Neither could Prof. Lee ever dream of seeing *his whale* taking wings unto itself and claiming a place among the feathered tribe of the heavens, or the angels of the Most High.

But how about the steam engine? Would any one be surprised to see it, in the near future, taking wings unto itself and creating a commotion in the heavens as well as among the great ones of the earth? Here again, our leviathan has the advantage over all his competitors.

I do not see, however, that any such inference can be drawn from the Hebrew text before us.

The Septuagint have another strange rendering here, which is: "When turning (or revolving) himself, he will cause terror among the quadrupeds treading upon the earth."

The novel idea expressed here, that the leviathan would *turn* or *revolve himself*, must have appeared very singular to many readers. It would seem, also, that the Septuagint understood that, when this monster would turn himself violently, it would frighten all the wild beasts of the earth.

Although this is not the exact idea contained in the present Hebrew text, yet it is very singular that it should apply, in such a striking manner, to the locomotive, which indeed, turns and revolves rapidly; in other words, *propels itself;* and, in so doing, frightens all the wild beasts treading along its path. From what could the Septuagint have obtained this idea? The very word *locomotive* has been given to the railroad steam engine to indicate that it has the power to propel itself from place to place. And it would seem that the Septuagint understood it so of the leviathan. He was to *roll on*, or *turn himself.*

Nowhere else do we find it stated by what means this creature propelled itself.

As to its terrifying the beasts of the forests, many, undoubtedly, still remember that when it was first proposed to build railroads through the country and the cities, that great objections were raised on the very grounds that they would terrify all the animals out of the forests.

Behold, also, our modern leviathan *rolling* on wheels and *propelling himself*, and on his path terrifying the beasts both of the earth and of the sea; and in this, fulfilling also the words of the Septuagint.

Let us see, now, if the Hebrew has not also locked up, in the intricate wording of this verse, some astonishing revelations which it has been unwilling to disclose up to the present.

Unless the original *lock* has been tampered with, I believe that *the key* which has already proved successful in thirty-four consecutive verses, will not fail to give us, in this instance also, a solution to the difficulties we meet with.

The first word of this verse (מִשְּׂאֵתוֹ) rendered: "When he raiseth up himself," or "at his rising," is rendered by the Septuagint: "The turning of himself." But this is certainly not the meaning of the Hebrew word under consideration. Its primary meaning is *a lifting up*, *a rising up*, *exaltation;* then, *a boiling up* as of waters.

Consequently we may render: "*From his lifting up* or *rising up* violently; or *from his furious boiling* the most courageous will fear.

All of which applies with astonishing precision to a locomotive when heated up and boiling violently, or when at the height of its rage, or going at the top of its speed.

Prof. Lee supposes that this refers to the *rising up* of the whale as she comes up to the surface of the water to attack her pursuers.

Albert Barnes supposes that it refers to the rousing up of this monster either for an attack or in self-defence. It must be admitted that neither of these interpretations would suit the primary meaning of the word as well as the *boiling up* of the heated waters of our own fiery monster. His becoming fierce and exalted by the *rising up* of his internal pressure.

The expression (יָגוּרוּ) *yagourou*, rendered here: "They will fear;" has such a variety of meanings that it has puzzled the most learned to select the proper one. In fact each word of this verse is a deep study in itself.

The primary meaning of the above word is: *to turn aside from the way;* then *to fear*, from the primary idea of *turning out of the way*. Kindred with these are the expressions *to go off, to turn aside*, or, *away; to depart.*

I consider though, that the proper meaning of the word here is, *to fear, to tremble.* As the word stands now in the Hebrew text, we would have to render it: *they will fear*, or *they will turn aside from the way;* meaning that, at the exaltations, or fierce ragings of this monster, the most courageous will fear, or would be inclined to turn aside from the way.

The Septuagint seem to have been of the opinion that this *turning from the way*, did not refer to the action of those who would be frightened at his raging, but to the very action of the leviathan itself, either in turning himself over, or in turning off from his way.

Either of these views will suit our locomotive, which often turns over, or off of its track; but it will not suit the text.

Adam Clarke says of this verse: "No version, either ancient or modern, appears to have understood this verse; nor is its true sense known."

The conclusion of this great commentator, is much in my favor, as no one would seem to have succeeded in making any sense of this verse in their endeavors to apply it to animals.

I give to (אֵילִים) *ailim*, the meaning of *the most courageous*, as others have.

This part of the verse would, then, mean: "At his boiling up; or, when at the height of his rage, the most courageous will fear."

The meaning and reference of this does not need much explanation in our days, when we have in our midst a fiery steed which travels at the terrible rate of fifty or sixty miles an hour, and whose anticipations are to reach a hundred. Then, indeed, will there be cause for fear and trembling at his violent boiling and at his fierce rage.

Most versions render the second part of this verse thus: "By reason of breakings they purify themselves." The meaning of this passage has never been satisfactorily explained. The word

(שֶׁבֶר) *shebher*, means *a breaking*, *a breaking down*, *fracture*, *destruction;* and in the form it appears here means, *from breakings;* or, *from fractures.*

The primary meaning of (חָטָא) *chata*, is *to miss;* then *to make a false step*, *to miss* one's way, to *lose one's self;* then *to purify one's self.*

The strictest literal rendering of these words would be: "They will purify themselves from breakings, or, against breakings, or fracture." I consider the meaning of this to be: "They will guard themselves against accidents."

In the sense of *missing one's way*, or *losing one's self*, we might consider this whole verse to have been intended to mean: "When at the height of his rage, the most courageous will fear, lest, from accidents (breakings) they should lose themselves or, should miss their way." Here I must express, my doubts that the verb, in this last sentence, was originally in the plural. Without the suffix it would make this passage apply to the locomotive itself, which would, indeed, be more likely, in case of breakings or accidents, to be the one that would lose himself, or miss his way—his track.

I am satisfied that the most skeptical will be astonished at this wonderfully true description of the dangers and fears experienced so often in our days, when our fearless monster, raising himself up to full speed, dashes along at a frightful rate over deep precipices and sharp curves, causing the most courageous passengers to fear lest, in his precipitate flight, some accident should happen, and they be hurled to destruction.

Here, then, is a most astonishing and direct reference to our modern lightning passenger trains. Otherwise who could those be who would here have occasion to fear accidents, and the loss of themselves, or the missing of the way?

One can hardly realize the possibility of such modern and daily occurrences being found so fully and vividly described in a book written so many centuries ago. And, what is no less astonishing, is the fact that they should have remained concealed so long after they had been fulfilled.

No animal that has been proposed, up to this day, has been found to possess all the requirements of this wonderful description. Our iron-shielded monster seems to stand alone as legitimate heir to the God-given name of Leviathan.

How modern these words of Job now sound. "When at his full speed the most courageous will fear lest, from accidents, they should miss their way."

May I not claim, in this instance, to have undone another Gordian knot, and to have added another powerful link to an already strong and unbroken chain of evidences?

HIS WANT OF WATER WILL CAUSE HIS DESTRUCTION.

Verse 26.

מְשִׂיגֵהוּ	When it exalteth him,	Cum apprehenderit
חֶרֶב	(חֶרֶב) dryness,	eum gladius,
בְּלִי	he will not have	non poterit
הָקוּם	power to resist;	subsistere,
חֲנִית	(חֲנוֹת) the curved vault	neque hasta
מַסָּע	(מַסָּע) being caused to break up,	neque
וְשִׁרְיָה׃	and also the armor.	thorax.

"The sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold; the spear, the dart, nor the habergeon."

The difficulties of this verse surpass anything I have met with in this description.

Its true sense does not seem to have been known. Translators have passed over many important words; and commentators have dismissed it with but a few remarks.

Its construction is so different from the preceding verses that one would be justified in supposing that some of its words had been accidentally transposed.

The word (חרב) rendered *sword*, has proved a great stumbling-block to all translators. None of them seem to have suspected that this word

might have been intended in a different sense. I look upon it as having here the meaning of (חָרֶב) *chorebh*, *dryness*, a want of water.

The verb *to be dry*, *to be dried up*, is composed of the same radical letters, and denotes, according to Gesenius, merely the absence, or failure, of water. It is used in this sense in Genesis chap. viii. 13. Ps. cvi. 9. The word occurring here is the same one met with in chap. xl. 19, and rendered, *his sword;* and interpreted of this monster's own power of destruction.

Whether we render it here by *dryness*, or *sword*, or *power of destruction*, it brings us, singularly enough, to the one and the same thing as being this terrible power, viz., fire and water, or their results—steam. Thus we can render this passage: "When dryness, or the sword, or destruction causeth him to increase, or causeth him to become exalted, furious, he will not have power to withhold."

This meaning of the word *sword*, will be seen to solve the difficulties which all have experienced with the expression (מַשִּׂיגֵהוּ) *massigehou*, which answers here as well, whether we derive it from *sagah*, or *chagah*.

Taking this word (חרב) as referring to a state of *dryness*, the meaning then would be that the leviathan will become *dry*, or that there will be within him *a want of water* which will cause him to *increase*, either in power or in fury; or, will cause him to become exalted. It is plain that this condition, according to the words before

us, will bring upon him insufficiency of strength to withhold. That is, this increase of his *destructive power—his sword;* or this state of great fury and excitement within him, for want of water, will be the cause that he will not have strength to contain himself. Consequently he will go to destruction. How this is accomplished is described in the second part of the verse.

This also divulges to us the true meaning of the expression (בְּלִי תָקוּם) *beli thakoum*, viz., *want of resistance; want of power to withhold.* By some writers, this *want of power*, is supposed to apply to the *sword;* by others, to the leviathan. The Vulgate expresses the true sense of the original; it renders: "When the sword will have taken hold of him, he will not be able to subsist." Yet the balance of the verse was not understood.

The reader will remember that I have already explained that, the expression *his sword*, which the maker of the behemoth was to apply unto him, referred to the terribly destructive power of steam, which man, in fact, applies to the steam engine which he has made. Here we find the leviathan threatened with destruction by the same power. By a slight variation of the pointing of the same word *sword*, or even by giving to it another of its accepted meanings, viz., dryness, we are confronted with the fact that here is revealed to us, under another form, the nature of this power of destruction, or rather the cause of its becoming such, viz., a want of water, dryness. For it is evident that the true sense of

the original is: "When dryness will have taken hold of him, he will not be able to withhold." It certainly cannot mean, literally, that when some one strikes at him with a sword he will not be able to subsist, since we are repeatedly told that his shields are impenetrable, and that neither arrows, nor spears, nor javelins can wound him. We cannot but conclude, then, that this word *sword*, must be taken figuratively for some terrible power of destruction, or literally as meaning *dryness, lack of water.* In the sense of the former, I have already shown its direct application to steam. Now, in the latter sense, we are forced to conclude that, the cause of this monster's destruction is water or the lack of it; or that this terrible power is accumulated at the expense of water, and that when there is not a sufficiency of it, this monster becomes furious; rages terribly; becomes exalted, or increases, (*sagah*), or *rises up* in some unaccountable manner; for the original words (*sagah*, or *shagah*) have all these significations. It appears also rather problematical, at first sight, that the very power given to this monster by its maker, should become such a terrible source of destruction to him; or, that a mere want of water should cause him to become so exalted and furious, that he would destroy himself.

It seems evident that the Lord did not intend that, the true meaning and reference of this great enigma should be discovered, by man, before its proper time.

But, let us see; have we not a very singular monster in our midst that does the very same thing? His name is well known. He lives on fire and water; and the more he can consume of both, the greater his power.

But should his burning flames preponderate over his supply of water, his natural violent rage *increases* (sagah) and *rises up* so suddenly that he is not able to withhold any longer, and at once he tears himself to pieces. What more is there required to fulfill the words of Job? Nothing but the name. Yet I can see this also, plainly inscribed on his shields.

Yes, evidently, the very cause of the explosion of a steam boiler is here referred to.

As every one knows, the less water there is in a kettle, the more fiercely it boils, and consequently the greater the volume of steam generated. If this kettle be air-tight, as is the case with the steam boiler, this sudden generation or increase of steam will cause it to explode, on account of the want of sufficient strength in the materials to withhold. No other monster has been found to furnish a more satisfactory explanation of the difficulties of this passage.

If we now compare this extraordinary revelation concerning the destruction of the leviathan with what is said of the destruction of the behemoth (chap. xl. 19), we will find, very unexpectedly, that these two wonderful monsters come to grief in precisely the same manner, and from the same identical cause.

I hardly need any better evidence to prove my assertion that these two monsters refer to the same power, steam; and that they differ only in the application of the same principle; and that what is here referred to, in either of these verses, is the well-known explosion or bursting of the boiler by a too great or too sudden generation of steam.

It would be hard to find on earth two such monsters who would be apt, in general, to meet their doom from precisely the same *extraordinary* cause, unless they were of the same species or nature, and exposed to the same defects and dangers. The boiler of our stationary engine and that of our locomotive, seem to be the only twin monsters which are apt to perform this extraordinary feat of bursting or disembowelling themselves.

As unexpected as the disclosures of this passage may be, they will still be equalled, if not surpassed, by more astonishing revelations concealed in the second member of this verse. The first word of it is, (חֲנִית) *chenith*, rendered *spear*, *lance;* it seems to me to have been written so by mistake of some scribe, or through an alteration in some manuscript by one who did not understand its true reference.

I consider that the original read (חָנוּת) *chanouth*, which means *a vault*, *a cell*, from the root (חָנָה) *chanah*, *to bend*, *to incline*, and refers here to some *curved* or *arched structure* connected with this monster.

The Septuagint and Vulgate have passed over

the word (מַסָּע) *massa*. Umbreit renders it *arrows*. I am at a loss to understand how they can attribute such a meaning to this word. Gesenius, it is true, gives *dart*, *arrow*, as some of its possible meanings, but his only authority is this very passage, where the meaning of the word has been doubtful. If such had been the recognized meaning of this word it would certainly have been made use of in the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth verses, where it is supposed that *arrows* and *darts* are meant.

Job, himself, speaking of *arrows* (chap. vi. 4), makes use of the word (חֲצֵי) *chatsats* which is the word almost exclusively made use of throughout the Scriptures when reference is had to an arrow. Nowhere do I find (מַסָּע) *massa* to have been used in that sense. Its doubtful meaning, or probably the difficulty they experienced in applying its proper meaning, would seem to have been the reason why the Septuagint and Vulgate passed it over.

This word was certainly never intended to mean here *darts*, *arrows*. It is a verb, and should have been pointed (מְסָּע) *moussa* from root (נָסַע) *nasa*, meaning *to break up*, *to tear away*. In this sense it applies to the above *curved vault*, it *being caused to break up*, *to tear away* from want of water, as indicated in the first part of the verse.

Another mistranslation, which I cannot account for, is the meaning of *lance*, and *javelin*, given to the word (שִׁרְיָה) *shiryah*, nowhere else has it been taken in that sense.

Its proper meaning is *a coat of mail*, *armor*.

Deriving its name either from being bright and glittering, or from being made of chains twisted together; or from hard and tough metal, (שְׁרִיר).

Both the Septuagint and Vulgate give it the meaning of *breast-plate.* French, *cuirasse.*

Undoubtedly here it refers to some hard substance with which the body of this monster is covered, and which serves to protect it, the same as a breast-plate is made use of to cover and protect the body of the wearer.

From the above interpretation of the meaning of these words, we would have: "The curved vault being caused to break up, and also the armor."

The meaning then, of the entire verse would be this: "When dryness exalteth him, he will not have strength to withhold; the curved vault being caused to break up, and also the armor."

The more I ponder over this wonderful revelation, the more I am dumbfounded and astonished. I can scarcely believe my own senses; like one who is amazed at the unexpected discovery of a great and valuable treasure. Yes, I have no doubt that, to the reflecting mind, this will prove a great treasure.

Job foresaw the complete structure of the steam engine. We have seen that he understood its principles of life and motion. Its enormous power, great beauty and vast influence, were clearly revealed to him. And here, finally, is made known, in a few concise word, his complete knowledge of one of its most terrible causes of destruction.

The *curved vault* here spoken of will be easily recognized by an engineer, as referring to the arched form of the *crown-sheet* forming the top of the fire-box of the boiler, and which is the first thing *to melt*, or *to break up*, when the water becomes too low to protect it.

As to the armor here mentioned it may refer either to the iron plates of the boiler itself, or to the *jacket* which surrounds it. All of this is, indeed, *torn away* in an instant when the fury of our monster gets too great, either from his allowance of water failing him or from being pushed too hard in an unequal contest. Then his powerful and majestic form becomes an object of horror and disgust to all who see him. Where, under the sun, can another be found which can be compared with this singular monster?

He is as unequalled in his glory and power as he is in the terrors of his destruction and downfall. Surely none other on earth this day can answer so well this sublime and astonishing description. None other can fulfill so completely the many wonderful things which are here enumerated. In the breaking up or *melting* of this *curved* or *arched vault*, we have also an irrefutable proof that this monster was made of iron which was exposed to a strong heat; for the expression, *to break*, or *to melt*, (מִסָּה) could not apply here if this monster was of flesh and blood.

NEITHER IRON NOR BRASS CAN RESIST HIM.

Verse 27

יַחְשֹׁב	He will esteem	Reputabit enim
לְתֶבֶן	as straw, chaff	quasi paleas
בַּרְזֶל	iron, (a thing of iron),	ferrum,
לַעֵץ	and as wood	et quasi lignum
רָקָבוֹן	rotten, or, hollow	putridum
נְחוּשָׁה׃	brass, (a thing of brass).	æs.

"He esteemeth iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood."

We have seen, in the previous verse, that when the leviathan's supply of water failed him, his great capacity to contain himself failed him also.

I consider that it is under these circumstances that occurs what we are told in this verse, viz., that things made of the most solid iron seem to be to him as straw or wickerwork; and those parts about him which were made of brass, were broken and destroyed with as much ease as if they were of rotten wood. In chap. xli. 17, under the description of the behemoth, we were told that some of his bones were *tubes of brass*, and others *solid bars of iron*. Undoubtedly these are here, in part, referred to. His bones, or his frame-work and his movable parts which are solid bars of iron, become

to him, under such circumstances, as mere straws or bands of straw. And his other parts, which are tubes of brass, become as hollow wood which is rotten and without strength.

One who has witnessed the explosion of a locomotive, or of a steam boiler, will be able to realize how poetic and true these expressions are. Indeed, the monster has torn asunder his heavy iron plates and his steel jacket, as completely as though they had been of rotten paper. His numerous and ponderous iron bars, he has twisted in every conceivable shape, as if he had been playing with straws. His pipes of brass and his heavy tubes of copper he has broken like pipe-stems, and has smashed and destroyed them as completely as though they had been of hollow rotten wood. In the outburst of his rage he has buried his head deep in the mire, and twisted all his limbs out of joint.

He has torn his body to shreds, disfigured his whole form beyond recognition, and scattered his bones and his entrails over the plain. And, as if to take revenge on those who excite him to destruction, he often scalds them with the raging vapors of his body, and chars their remains with the burning coals of his mouth. Such is, indeed, the power and fury of our modern leviathan when excited beyond measure.

Taking this verse in its generally accepted meaning, that "Iron is to him as straw, and brass as rotten wood," we may find that it has a very wide application in connection with our

powerful steam machines. If we glance into our modern machine shops, where behemoth is at work, we will find him actually turning huge pieces of iron into ringlets like straw.

Enormous casting of brass he grinds and chips with as much ease as if they were of rotten wood. In fact, the crumblings of a brass casting in the turning lathe do resemble the crumblings of rotten wood.

So that either way we look at this verse, we find that it has a meaning perfectly agreeable to facts know to us in connection with the powers of steam.

Indeed Job could not have described the astonishing powers of our herculean monster any better than when he said: "He will esteem iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood."

If this leviathan were a wild animal, would it not appear somewhat singular that he should be represented as having so much to do with iron, and brass, and coals of fire, instead of the trees of the forests and wild monsters like himself, which he would be more apt to encounter than iron or brass?

FEAR IS UNKNOWN TO HIM.

Verse 28.

לֹא־	He will not	Non
יַבְרִיחֶנּוּ	make this one flee	fugabit eum
בֶּן־קָשֶׁת	the son of the bow;	vir sagittarius,
לְקַשׁ	as chaff, motes	in stipulam
נֶהְפְּכוּ־לוֹ	are turned unto him,	versi sunt ei
אַבְנֵי־	stones of	lapides
קֶלַע׃	the sling (missiles).	fundæ.

"The arrow cannot make him flee; sling-stones are turned with him into stubble."

This verse, and also the one following it, evidently refer to the fearless nature of the leviathan; and, from the wording of these verses, it would appear as though he was to be somewhat associated with warriors and materials of war.

Our English versions unanimously render the first member of this verse by: "The arrow cannot make him flee." This in not quite the literal meaning of the Hebrew, nor is it the sense intended to be conveyed by the original expressions, which are: "The son of the bow will not make this one flee."

It seems to me quite evident that the expression *the son of the bow*, does not refer here, to

an *arrow*, but rather to *archers*, *warriors*, the true sons of the bow.

In Lamentations iii. 13; arrows are more properly denoted as "sons of the quiver."

The Vulgate has the proper rendering: "Vir sagittarius"—the archer.

The word *son*, is an expression often made use of in Oriental languages, to denote any one thing produced by, or emanating from, another. For instance a spark from the fire is called *son of the fire*. An arrow is called *son of the quiver*, etc.

It may be in this sense that we are to understand the expression "the sons of God" which occurs in the first chapter of the book of Job, verse 6; that is, in the sense that these *sons of God* referred to most worthy beings emanating from the hands of God; beings created by Him.

The words *father* and *mother*, have the same latitude of meaning in the poetic language of the Orientals.

Might we not derive from this an idea why Christ is called *the Son* of God? Not that God was Christ's progenitor, but that Christ came from God the same as a spark comes from the fire.

A spark is of the same substance as the fire from which it emanates; yet, upon assuming an individuality of its own, is called *a son* of that fire, possessed of the same nature and faculties as the source from which it came.

The Septuagint, in their rendering of this part

of the verse, are quite different from any other; they have: "The bow of brass will not wound him."

They may have meant by this, that the strongest bow, even one of brass, could not wound him. But the original does not refer here to his invulnerability, but to his fearless nature.

The sense, undoubtedly, is, that he would not flee or tremble at the sight of a whole army of archers.

The clatter of arms and the sight of a multitude of warriors would cause any animal to flee, but it is not the case with this one. He has neither heart nor feelings. Fear is unknown to him.

All this suits, to an eminent degree, our iron-clad monster. He has become of late quite a helpmate in warfare. He is not easily wounded, and charges with boldness and great rapidity. He rests without fear in the midst of a great conflict. The clatter of arms do not cause him to flee. During late wars he has even been converted into an iron-clad battery. Surely then, arrows would not have made much impression on him.

The second part of this verse rendered: "Sling-stones are turned with him unto stubble," has been understood by commentators in general, as referring to the invulnerability of the leviathan.

I am satisfied that it has not that meaning; it would be but a useless repetition of what has so often been referred to in various ways.

The original, rendered verbatim, reads: "As chaff, are turned unto him, stones of the sling." These *stones of the sling*, are undoubtedly intended here to denote *missiles*, or war materials of that kind.

It is not said here, as in the previous verse, that *he esteems as chaff* these things. Nor is the expression the same as the one made use of in the verse following, where it is said that *he esteems darts* as chaff. But here an entirely different expression is made use of. It is said that these stones of the sling, or missiles, are *turned unto him*, as chaff. In other word, that these things *are turned over* to him the same as the most ordinary and harmless things are.

It is easy to perceive that this passage could not have been understood in this sense by those who supposed that some wild animal was here referred to. Consequently, they rendered to suit their views.

But with me the case is different, for I have discoved a strange monster to which apply, in a singular manner, all these hard sayings. Yes, even modern sling-stones, or missiles of war, as well as war implement, are turned over unto our leviathan in great quantities, especially in war times. And he thinks no more of them than if he were loaded with the most ordinary and harmless things. Their enormous weight is nothing to him. The explosive nature of the ammunition that he carries within his coils has no terror for him. He beholds them with the same indifference that he does his ordinary chaff.

Here, then, is a clear reference to the utility of our railroads in war times.

After this the reader need not be surprised as to what may come next.

This verse should then read: "The archer will not make this one flee. Missiles *of war* will be turned unto him as chaff."

Our leviathan is, indeed, a strange monster. He can fill his coils with sharp and pointed instruments without the least inconvenience to himself. He can always increase his capacity to suit the occasion. Should any of his members become damaged, another will soon replace it; for, as we have seen in a previous verse, his members are detachable. Behold, even his head can be parted from his serpent-like body, and united to it again at will.

He has been often seen without a spark of life, and then, at once, made alive again by the enchanting rod of his keeper. Should he die forever, the whole world would mourn his loss. Great cities would be turned into darkness. Others would vanish from their places; and many people would perish from distress. That this might not happen, his creator has endowed him with an iron constitution, and protected his body with impenetrable shields. Yea, he has given him bones of iron and steel, and has made his race to last for ever.

HE REJOICETH AT THE POKING OF THE FIREMAN.

Verse 29.

כֶּקֶשׁ	As chaff	Quasi stipulum
נֶחְשְׁבוּ	they are esteemed	æstimabit
תוֹתָח	the strokes of a club, or hammer;	malleum,
וַיִּשְׂחַק	and he will laugh, rejoice	et deridebit
לְרַעַשׁ	at the shaking, poking	vibrantem
כִּידוֹן׃	of the fireman.	hastem.

"Darts are counted as stubble; he laugheth at the shaking of a spear."

THE meaning generally attributed to this verse seems to be but a repetition of the idea expressed in former ones, viz., that darts and spears are as chaff to him.

I consider as more probable that the word (תוֹתָח) *thothach*, rendered *clubs*, *darts*, has the meaning of *hammer*, *sledge*. The Septuagint and Vulgate both give it that meaning.

But I consider that this word is the subject, and not the object of the verb *to esteem*. And as the verb is in the plural so should be its subject; therefore I look upon this word as meaning *the strokes of a hammer*. This gives us, as

the meaning of this passage: "The strokes of a hammer are esteemed as chaff."

The Vulgate has: "As stubble will he esteem the hammer." I cannot see in what sense *a hammer* can be said to be as stubble to him, unless, as I have just shown, the original be intended for *the strokes of a hammer*.

The Septuagint have: "Hammers are esteemed as stubble."

This version does not render this passage any more intelligible than the one quoted above. But we may suppose that *hammerings*, or *the strokes of a hammer* are here meant, and, from what we have already seen of the nature of this monster, that it may refer to a machine constructed of iron, or the like, which would be likely to be repeatedly struck with heavy hammers and sledges during the process of its construction. In this sense we may conclude that the leviathan is, at times, struck with a hammer; but, on account of his nature, that these strokes are as nothing (chaff) to him.

If we but glance at our huge locomotive, when in process of construction, we will at once realize how applicable to him are these singular expressions.

His limbs are rolled and pressed, and fashioned with heavy sledges. The iron plates which form his body are being rivetted and welded with the repeated strokes of heavy hammers. The clattering noise of the repeated blows he is receiving from all sides is almost deafening, yet from the sounds he emits, one might think that he is rejoicing, and laughing the louder, the heavier the

blows he receives, as though scorning the efforts of those who are beating him.

When his masters are through with him, every inch on his back bears the marks of the blows he has sustained. Yet, strange to say, he gives evidence of being stronger than ever, and by his wonderful feats of valor soon becomes the admiration of all.

His shields are passed through the fire as if to prepare them for the great heat to which he is to be exposed. And his body is reared up and strengthened by blows, that he may be able to withstand the terrible shocks which await him on his way.

Where is there to be found, among wild animals, one which can boast, with as much propriety, that the blows of a hammer are as chaff to him.

The balance of this verse is no less astonishing and true than what we have just seen; but it has not received full justice at the hands of our translators.

Most versions render it: "He laugheth at the shaking of a spear."

The vulgate has: "He will laugh him to scorn who shaketh the spear."

The original is susceptible of a variety of meanings. Besides the above we might render: "He will rejoice at the raging of war, or, at a conflagration."

I consider that the (כִּידוֹן) *kidon* rendered *spear*, *javelin;* is a derivative of (כָּדַד) *kadad*, meaning *to beat*, *to pound*, hence *to strike fire;* and in this

instance to *one who beats* or *pokes the fire;* viz., a fireman. Therefore I render: "He will rejoice at the shaking (or, poking) of the fireman."

This is also the meaning given to this passage by the Septuagint: "Καταγελα δε σείσμου πυρφόρου." He rejoiceth at the shaking of the fire-bearer.

Could anything be more unexpected than the finding of such strange and conclusive evidence of the nature of the leviathan?

We have seen in verse 21, that *his inhaling* is said to *vivify the coals of fire.* And here, undoubtedly, it is at the poking of this same fire by the fireman, that he is said to rejoice.

I would have felt it hazardous for the success of my work, to have ventured to assert, at the beginning, that Job even made mention of a fireman poking the fire which was inside of this monster. Luckily my views are fully corroborated by the Septuagint, as shown above.

The reader will fully realize the propriety and poetry there is in saying of our intrepid and fleet-footed monster, who seeks no better than to show his great power and lightning speed, that he rejoiceth at the increasing courage he feels instilled into his blood at each touch of the life-giving rod of the fireman.

This singular verse will now become interesting to those who have charge of Job's great leviathan. From all that I can see, it was originally intended to read: "The strokes of a hammer (or, of a club) will be esteemed as chaff; and he will rejoice at the poking of the fireman."

In reference to this same leviathan we find a singular passage in Job, chap. iii. 8, where he calls down dire imprecations upon the night of his birth. It reads: "Let them curse it who curse the day, them who are ready to raise up a leviathan."

The Septuagint render: "They who are on the eve of subjugating the leviathan."

Prof. Lee has: "Let them who curse the day stigmatize it, who are ready to stir up *the* leviathan."

As to the word (עֲתִידִים) *athidim*, rendered, *they who are ready;* it has also the meaning of *they who are prepared*, *destined*, *practiced*, *skilful*, either in *bringing forth* or *handling* the leviathan. Therefore we may look upon this passage as referring to some nation that was either destined to bring forth this leviathan, or that would be skilful in handling him or stirring him up.

As to the difficulties of this verse, and the doubtful meaning of these "cursers of day," Barnes, in his notes on this passage, says: "This entire verse is exceedingly difficult, and many different expositions have been given of it. The practice of cursing the day, or cursing the sun, is said by Herodotus to have prevailed among the people of Africa, whom he calls the Atlantes, living in the vicinity of Mount Atlas. "Of all mankind," says he, "of whom we have any knowledge, the Atlantes alone have no distinction of names; the body of the people are termed Atlantes, but their individuals have

no appropriate appellation. When the sun is at the highest they heap on it reproaches and execrations, because their country and themselves are parched by its rays." Still, Barnes supposes that reference is had here to diviners who were supposed to have power to render a day of ill omen.

But I doubt very much that Job intended to refer here to any such people; but rather that he calls on all those who, like himself, on account of overwhelming grief and distress, curse *the very day* of their birth. Then, in the second member of the verse, he calls on *even them who* (הָ) would be destined to bring forth, or to manage with skill, this terrible leviathan.

Therefore I would render: "Let them who curse their own day, curse it; even them who are destined to bring forth the leviathan."

In this light, this astonishing and difficult verse, may refer either to England or America; as both countries have been very prominent and successful in bringing forth and developing our numerous and wonderful appliances of steam, and both very skilful in handling and *stirring up* to full speed our modern leviathan. This is another of those difficult passages which find a natural and astonishing solution when viewed as referring to our modern engine of power.

HE WILL SPREAD HIMSELF A BED OVER MARSHY PLACES.

Verse 30.

תַּחְתָּיו	His underparts	Sub ipso
חַדּוּדֵי	notched stakes, hewed timbers	erunt radii
חָרֵשׁ	of the artificer; (חָרָשׁ)	solis;
יִרְפַּד	He will spread	et sternet sibi
חָרוּץ	a trench, or, an embankment	aurum
עַל־טִיט׃	upon the mire.	quasi lutum.

"Sharp stones are under him; he spreadeth sharp pointed things upon the mire."

This verse, like many others, has proved a vexation to all who labored to fathom its mysteries. Its true meaning seems to have remained a deep secret up to the present day.

I have not found a commentator who seemed to be satisfied that he had succeeded in elucidating its difficulties. Undoubtedly, had they possessed the key to this description, they would have left us quite a different version from the one we have at present.

The principal cause of the trouble has been, as in many other instances, the various and widely different interpretations of which the orginal words are susceptible.

The Vulgate is so different from all other versions, that one would be inclined to believe that it had obtained its ideas from an entirely different source from the one we now have at hand. It renders: "The rays of the sun will be beneath him; and he will spread under himself gold as clay." This is about as difficult to understand as the original itself. The Septuagint have also a singular reading, which is: "His bed is of sharp stones, and all the gold of the sea is beneath him as the mire the most vile."

It is evident that these seventy enlightened scholars were as much at sea, concerning the meaning of this verse, as most of those of our own days. Albert Barnes renders as follows: "Under him are sharp potsherds; he spreadeth out his rough parts upon the mire."

The late Revised Version of Oxford has: "His underparts are *like* sharp potsherds. He spreadeth *as it were* a threshing wain upon the mire." This is by far the most literal rendering of any of the above. Still, the reference of the second hemistich is not easily perceived.

By explaining the difficulties of each word of this verse separately, the reader will have an idea of the perplexities which translators often meet with.

The first word, as seen at the beginning, means, *his underneath parts*. It is the same word which occurs in the twenty-fourth verse designating something *low, beneath;* and which, according to

the requirements of that verse, I rendered *the lower rocks*, *the nether stones*.

In both instances it is an adjective without the noun or the name of the thing or things which it is intended to qualify. This often occurs when the name of the object is not known, or when it is left to be inferred from the context. It would seem, in this instance—and this can apply to this entire description—that the writer did not intend to specify things so clearly that any one could comprehend them before the time of their fulfilment. Such is found to be the case with most prophecies.

Here, then, this word is evidently intended to refer to *things* which were *underneath* this monster, literally, *his underneath* parts.

Some translators, supposing that the bed of this monster was intended, translated accordingly. Others render, *under him*, which is not literally correct, as the pronominal suffix, in the Hebrew, is in the possessive and not in the objective case. Then again the adjective is in the plural; so that it cannot be literally rendered otherwise than by *his underneath parts*, or *his underparts*. What these *underparts* are, is obscurely indicated by the two words which follow, (חַדּוּדֵי חָרִישׁ). Unfortunately the former, in its present form, seems to be also an adjective in the plural, meaning something *sharp*, *hewed*, *cut into*. I consider that the reference here is to *notched timbers*. This word seems to be intended to qualify the one following it—(חרישׁ). But when we consider how

many different meanings may be given to this word by simply varying its pointing—which, after all, must be admitted to be often very arbitrary—we will find ourselves in a dilemma from which we cannot very easily extricate ourselves.

The word, as it now appears, means *a sherd, potsherd, i. e.*, a fragment of an earthen vessel. The same letters pointed thus (חָרַשׁ) *charash*, mean *to cut, to grave, to make.* Then (חָרָשׁ) *charash, an artificer, craftsman.* Then (חֶרֶשׁ) *cheresh*, artificial work; (חֹרַשׁ) *chorash, a cutting instrument;* (חֹרֶשׁ) *choresh*, a thicket; and Chaldee (חֲרַשׁ) *charash, to be entangled, interwoven*, etc., Thus the original might have have been pointed by the Masorites so as to have had any of the above meanings; as, in many instances, they must have been guided by their own ideas of the meaning of a word. In the first instance it might be rendered, "His underparts *are* sharp *pieces* of a potsherd." But it is evident that this cannot be literally true of any animal. A *potsherd* is only *a fragment* of earthenware.

According to this, the meaning would be that, the underneath parts of this monster were *sharp pieces of a fragment.* Take notice that the original does not say that these parts were *like*, or *similar to* fragments, although so rendered by many.

Taken in the sense of (חָרָשׁ) *charash*, which I consider to be the word intended here, and meaning artificer, craftsman, we have the following

plausible meaning: "His underparts are sharp (or notched) stakes of the artificer." Or we may render: "The parts which are underneath him are sharp stakes, or notched timbers of the craftsman."

In this verse it would seem that what is intended is not certain members of this monster's body, but parts which were independent of him, and which were *notched*, *cut into;* the handy work of man. Most likely this is an allusion to some sort of frame-work, of which the timbers were *cut* and *notched* to fit into each other. This was located underneath him and formed something upon which he rested as though it had formed his bed. In fact such is the sense attributed to these words by the Septuagint; that is, they looked upon these *sharp things* as forming the bed upon which the leviathan rested.

A glance at our locomotive, as he glides along on his iron-bound bed, will soon reveal to us the possibility of these artificially wrought works referring to the construction of the railroad track. It is a fine and substantial piece of workmanship, formed of timbers *cut* and *notched* to suit; and of elongated and narrow steel bands or rails, also the work of the artificer, as the text requires.

All this is substantially united and braced together, or *interwoven*, as implied in the Chaldee sense of the word (חֲרַשׁ) *charash*. This forms, really—as the Septuagint have it—the bed of this monster, that upon which he *rests* and *rolls*.

Thus this passage, which has puzzled so many, would be to us another very unexpected revelation.

Yet, a very appropriate meaning, and one which is as likely to have been intended as the above, may be derived from the same words of this passage.

Taking the word (חַדֻּדֵי) *chaddouday*, as referring to sharp-pointed stakes, or to timbers skilfully wrought, or cut, (the work of the artificer) we would have: "His underparts are sharp-pointed stakes, or, timbers skilfully wrought."

Here then, would be our modern trestle works, made of long sharp spiles, or timbers skilfully wrought, and united together with cross beams and braces, and upon which rest the rails of the track.

This meaning is no less extraordinary than the first; and, as I have just said, just as likely to have been intended. In fact it would agree better with the Septuagint, who liken these *sharp things*, to long, sharp obelisks. These were tall, square pillars, gradually tapering as they rose, and erected in honor of distinguished personages. A row of such pillars with braces between them, and iron rails above, would correspond very well to many of our high railroad bridges. But the original Hebrew would seem to favor the idea of long pointed stakes, or, pieces of hewn or notched timbers, rather than that of high square pillars.

This passage, then, can refer either to a railroad track, as a piece of artificial work, or to the skilfully wrought timbers of our trestle works.

Both are essential to the onward progress of a locomotive, and really constitute, as the text

requires, his underparts. Both are closely related, in nature and purpose, to all we have discovered of this wonderful monster.

As to the second member of this verse, I surmise that it will be no less surprising to the reader than the first. The word (רָפַד) *raphad*, means, *to spread*, in the sense of one spreading his bed. It means also *to pave* a road, *to spread* a road with something.

The Latin word used here by the Vulgate has also this meaning. The next word,—the one on which has been wrecked the whole meaning of this passage—is (חָרוּץ) *charouts*, which means, primarily, something *cut down*, or, *cut into;* from which *a ditch*, *a trench;* also *a furrow*, *an embankment*, from being *elevated* and *cut down* or *dug out* on each side. This word has also been taken here, by some translators, to refer to *a threshing sledge*. In ancient times these sledges were constructed in various ways.

The one which might have been referred to here was made like a low truck, such as is often used for carrying heavy stones, and had, instead of wheels, heavy rollers of wood or stone. This they rolled over the straw with oxen.

I cannot see how this meaning of the word could find a place here, unless it is meant that, what was *spread* underneath the leviathan resembled a truck or a threshing sledge, and that it rolled "over marshy places."

Although quite applicable to our railroad trucks, I cannot admit that the original word has been

intended in that sense here, although it may in the sense of *a sledging machine*, or what we now call a spile-driver.

This would give also two very unexpected and quite plausible meanings to this second part of the verse.

The first would be: "He will spread a trench (or an embankment) upon the mire." And the second: "He will spread *it with* a sledge upon the mire," meaning that the interwoven work, or trestle work, mentioned in the first part of the verse, would be *extended* and constructed over marshy places by means of some sort of a sledge, or spile-driver, which would sledge down the sharp spiles in marshy places, that the leviathan might pass over in safety.

What will our *modern* railroad engineers say to this? I say *modern*, because it is now quite evident that Job knew all about railroads and railroad bridges long before they did. He beheld and admired, centuries ago, the marvels of engineering and skill of the nineteenth century. He knew, long before us, that a boiling caldron would be made to run to and fro, and to lash the sea like a huge monster.

He evidently saw the engine *spreading* its own *bed* or *embankment* over marshy places; and extending his way over rivers by means of long and sharp spiles driven down by our modern steam sledging machines. Or a Brooklyn bridge *spread over* immense pillars resembling the obelisks of old.

It is also singular and worthy of remark how often, in this description, we meet with the very technical expressions made use of in our days by railroad engineers.

For instance, in one sense of the present verse, Job speaks of the locomotive *spreading* its own *bed.* The space which lies between the rails and upon which rest the cross-ties, is called this day the *bed* of the road; it is generally *spread* with gravel or sand carried along the road by the engine itself.

It is amusing to see to what length some commentators have gone to show how this verse could apply either to the whale or to the crocodile. It is an interesting study to compare their various works.

I fancy that our iron-shielded monster is destined to crash into many of these valuable works; to explode a number of old theories, and to tread under his iron hoofs all the wild monsters which will dare to dispute his claims to the championship, and to the name of *leviathan.* He seems destined also to avenge the name of the great prophet, Job.

I would now offer the following as the literal meaning of this extraordinary verse.

"His underparts are hewed timbers of the craftsman. He will spread an embankment upon the mire."

HE WILL CAUSE THE SEA TO BOIL.

Verse 31.

יַרְתִּיחַ	He will cause to be	Fervescere faciet
כַּסִּיר	as a boiling pot	quasi ollam
מְצוּלָה	the deep *places;*	profundum
יָם	the sea	mare,
יָשִׂים	he will render	et ponet
כַּמֵּרְקָחָה׃	as boiling ointment	quasi cum unguenta [bulliunt.

"He maketh the deep sea to boil like a pot, he maketh the sea like a pot of ointment."

So far, everything that has been said of the leviathan has corresponded, in an extraordinary manner, with the locomotive, or self-propelling steam engine.

But now, in this verse, it is evident that the allusion is to some powerful sea monster.

He is represented as ploughing up the deep places and lashing the waters, even of the great seas, with such terrible force that they foam and boil up as though they were a kettle of boiling oil.

It is evident also from the wording of the original, that two different bodies of water are here meant. This must be inferred from the difference of the words made use of, and from

the reasonable supposition that, had a similar body of water been intended in both instances, the same word would have been repeated.

Consequently this difference should be indicated in our translations. *The deep*, and *the sea*, are synomymous expressions, denoting with us the same thing. It would therefore be better to render this passage: 'He maketh the deep *places*, or the deep *rivers* to boil like a pot." It is evident to me that the idea intended to be conveyed by these *deep places* is, that this creature could not easily move about in shallow water nor in low marshy places. If so, neither the crocodile nor the hippopotamus could have been meant here. Neither are they sea monsters. Neither do they amuse themselves in lashing the *sea* in the extraordinary manner above described.

It must also be inferred that the monster here meant, felt as much at home in the midst of the sea as he did in the deep rivers of fresh water, which is not the case with the two creatures above mentioned. Some deep sea monster could make out a better claim here. But, again, these terrible monsters of the deep do not inhabit fresh water streams. Even so, all that has been said of the leviathan should also be found to apply to such a monster; and none have been found possessing all the required attributes. Even the powerful champions of the crocodile and of the whale have had a hard task to reduce the armor of the leviathan to fit their favorites.

It might be well to quote here,—although I

will refer to it more fully at the end of this chapter—the extraordinary passage which occurs in Psl. civ. 26: "There the ships go to and fro; *and* leviathan, that one which thou hast formed to sport therein." This leviathan, then, must have been formed to sport also in the high seas where the ships go to and fro. It is evident also that it can no longer be understood of a locomotive. For a locomotive does not run in rivers or the sea.

Now it will be remembered that, at the beginning of this forty-first chapter, I claimed that the only difference between the behemoth and the leviathan was, that the former was intended to refer more particularly to the stationary steam engine, whilst the latter referred to the locomotive, or, to the *self-propelling engine on sea or on land*.

In the verse under consideration, it is still *the self-propelling steam engine* which is had in view, but under a new form and in a new capacity.

It is here our self-propelling marine engine, or steam as applied to steamships and steamboats.

To what monster of the deep could the words of this verse apply with more force and propriety than to those tremendous and exceedingly powerful engines which propel our monster ships through the deep seas?

With its terrible revolving fins, this creature of destiny lashes the briny deep into billows of raging foam till it seems, indeed, like a kettle of boiling oil.

He makes of the sea a place of promenade.

A deep river he causes to swell and boil as though it were "a pot of boiling water. This is easily understood of the huge swells and great agitation of the water caused by the paddle wheels.

Our steamships and steamboats abhor shallow water and marshy places. Therefore is the leviathan spoken of as sporting only in deep places.

It is also a singular fact that the largest and most powerful steamship ever built was called the *Leviathan*. I have reference to the one which was afterwards named The Great Eastern.

Our modern monster of power is, therefore, also amphibious, and fulfills to the letter the words of this verse; viz., "He will cause deep places to become as a boiling pot; he will make the sea to appear like boiling ointment."

HE LEAVES A FOAMING PATH BEHIND HIM.

Verse 32.

אַחֲרָיו	His hinder part (or parts)	Post eum
יָאִיר	will cause to shine	lucebit
נָתִיב	a path.	semita.
יַחְשֹׁב	One will think	Æstimabit
תְּהוֹם	the deep sea	abyssum
לְשֵׂיבָה׃	as if growing gray.	quasi senescentem.

"He maketh a path to shine after him; one would think the deep to be hoary."

THIS verse is not difficult to understand. With the exception of the Septuagint, all agree in their renderings.

Some commentators, however, differ as to the proper application of the word rendered *sea*. Those who look upon the crocodile as being alluded to, suppose that it refers to some large river, or to the Nile.

Prof. Lee, referring to Bochart, in loco, says that "he has not been able to show that (תְּהוֹם) *tehom*, has ever been applied to any river, much less the Nile."

The Septuagint have: "The unknown expanse of the deep is as a captive to him; he converteth the deep into a place of promenade."

This is another of those singular passages we meet with in this Greek Version. Where they got their ideas from will probably never be known to us.

It is singular that seventy of the best scholars of those days should here all agree to this rendering of the Hebrew. It would appear more probable that they followed some old tradition or manuscript, with which we are unacquainted.

Nevertheless it is worthy of a place among the original ones.

We must concede that it agrees well with the character of this description, and suits, in a remarkable manner, the views I have advanced. Steam has, indeed, conquered the sea and its terrors; and has made, of its vast expanse, a sporting-ground.

It is evident that the Septuagint looked upon the leviathan as the master of the deep, and not as a crocodile or any other such insignificant creature of the mire.

Upon closer study of this verse, I find that there is expressed in it an idea which does not seem to have been noticed, and which has some value under the present circumstances.

The first word of this verse which has been rendered, "after him," is not an adjective, but a substantive and should be rendered, *his hinder parts*. The original word is far more frequently used in the plural. With suffixes—as in the present case—the plural form is always used. (Gesenius, lex.)

Consequently we should read: "His hinder parts will cause a path to shine." We have seen described in the previous verse the action of the paddle-wheels of a steamboat, as they lash the waters into foaming billows.

In a certain class of boats and ships, these wheels are located on each side; and I presume it is to this class of boats that the description of the previous verse refers.

But here it would appear that these parts which caused his path to shine, were located *at the rear*, and not at the sides of the one alluded to.

I can see, then, in the first word of this verse, a direct allusion to our *stern-wheel* ships and steamboats.

Most of our steamships of to-day are built with screw propellers, and many of our Mississippi boats—on account of the narrow and shallow stream they navigate—are obliged to place their propelling wheel in the rear.

Really it would seem as though the holy man Job was not of the past, but of the present. Or as though he had been transported in spirit to these localities. He seems to have seen our overflows, and steam drainage machines (chap. xl. 23, 24.) He has just described our trestle-works and road-beds laid through our numerous marshy places.

And now he sees and describes either those unique stern-wheel boats, or our modern steamships with screw propellers.

The literal rendering of this verse is: "His

hinder parts will cause a path to shine; one will think the deep to be growing gray."

The reference of this description to the well-know action of a powerful steamer, cannot be mistaken. Who has not often admired the sparkling path of hoary foam which our swift steamers leave after them, as they pass through the briny deep? They cause Neptune to boil and foam with such rage that, indeed, one would think that his locks had turned gray with fright; whilst his whole face frowns with deep furrows and huge wrinkles, at the rapid advance of this new Monarch of the deep. And well he may, for Leviathan has come to conquer his domains and all his tributaries, and to banish for ever the terrors of his name.

UPON EARTH THERE IS NOTHING LIKE HIM.

Verse 33.

אֵין־	There is none, or, nothing,	Non est potestas
עַל־עָפָר	upon the dust, earth	super terram
כְּמֹשָׁלוֹ	like him,	quæ comparetur ei
הֶעָשׂוּ	he that is made—constructed	qui factus est
לִבְלִי־חָת׃	that he can fear nothing.	ut nullum timeret.

"Upon earth there is not his like, who is made without fear."

THIS will be found to be a very important verse. Although it does not appear, at first sight, to contain any extraordinary disclosures, yet the broad assertion that, "upon earth there is not his like," would seem to exclude the possibility of there being then on earth, or of having been up to that time, any animal or mechanical device at all like this leviathan.

The Vulgate has inserted the word *potestas*,—*power;* giving to the first member of this verse the following meaning: "There is not upon earth *a power* which can be compared to him."

Although this rendering is strongly in my favor, yet I prefer the original, which I render: "There is nothing upon the dust (or, upon the whole earth) like him; he that is *so* constructed that he can fear nothing.

As will be observed, the original does not limit its comparsion to *a power*, nor to *an animal*. It emphatically asserts that, "*There is* nothing upon the dust (or, upon the whole earth,) like him."

The italicized words are not expressed in the original, although usually included in the idea conveyed by the word *nothing* or *not*. We could as well render, *there was nothing*, or, *there will be nothing*, if the context required it.

Therefore it cannot be argued that the comparison is intended only with such monsters as were *then* in existence.

Moreover it is well to bear in mind that it has never been definitely decided, up to the present day, to what animal or animals the wonderful attributes of behemoth and leviathan could apply.

Then again the word *animal* or, *beast* does not occur once in any of the forty-four verses of this description. At times it would seem most essential and natural that either of the above names should appear, yet, as if for some mysterious reason, they do not. For instance in the present verse, how natural to have said (if this description referred to an animal), "There is no animal upon earth like this one."

Yet this would not have settled the question according to the views of some of our expositors.

For they who favor the whale, try to make a point of this by arguing that it is here meant that, there is no animal *on land* at all comparable to this creature *of the sea*.

Prof. Lee says: "The distinction intended is, that, as this is a water animal, no such other can be found on land. But this cannot be said of the crocodile, which is amphibious."

To this I would answer that the Professor is evidently arguing from a very gratuitous assumption.

Nowhere is it stated that the leviathan here described, is an animal. Neither is it at all distinctly asserted that the leviathan is to be found exclusively in the water, or on the land.

On the contrary, the most learned exegetists have decided that the one here meant must have been amphibious.

Moreover, to assert that it is intended, in this verse, to establish a distinction between this *water animal* and all *land animals*, is, to say the least, very improbable.

The natural distinction itself, between these two species of creatures, is so great that it almost entirely precludes the necessity of affirming any such distinction; and especially in a case where, as claimed here by Prof. Lee, reference is had exclusively to some water animal. Surely no one would expect to find anything like a whale upon land.

Then again is it not absurb to say that what is meant here, is, that there can be found on land no other such water animal as this?

As it has seemed evident to the best scholars who have made a serious study of this description, that an amphibious monster is here alluded

to, then the expression *upon the dust, upon the earth*, would have to be accepted as referring to the whole world, land and water That is, the leviathan on land has not its equal or its like among all the creatures of the earth. And, as a sea monster, his like or his equal, cannot be found among all the animals of the deep.

This would give to the original words their broadest and fullest sense, viz., that there is nothing on the face of the whole earth which can be compared to this one.

Naturally, in a comparison between the leviathan and the animals of the earth or of the sea, we would be limited to the points of excellence claimed for him in the description given. This is what I have aimed to do in comparing the extraordinary attributes of the so-called leviathan with the well-known capacities of our modern creature of power.

If the latter has filled the description, even better than anything else which has been proposed, then the probability of having discovered the long-sought-for leviathan will become a matter of study and discussion for those who feel interested in such an extraordinary claim.

With the majority will rest the final decision.

But, unless they discover some yet unheard-of iron-ribbed and fiery flying serpent, I am confident our modern leviathan will have no cause to fear, any more than he fears now an elephant or a crocodile with which he often sports on the way.

It would appear then, from the wording of

this passage, that the leviathan could have had no rivals, neither upon land nor in the sea. This is certainly claiming a great deal more for this one than can be claimed for any monster of which we have any knowledge.

It could not apply to any species of whale for they all have enemies which worry them and even cause their death.

Then there is no species of whale which is so unlike any other that it can be said that, *there is nothing like him.*

Moreover a whale is not amphibious. For similar reasons this verse could not apply to the elephant.

Neither can this verse apply to the crocodile, for he has not only his equal on land, but also animals which are by far his superiors in many respects.

Undoubtedly many a mastodon would have thought little of him as a rival.

The only points in which he seems to answer the description of the leviathan are, his impenetrable scales and his amphibious nature. Yet in these respects he does not excel even an ordinary large sea turtle.

Then again, the crocodile is not a creature of the sea. Neither can it be claimed that he has not, in some way, his like or his equal in the sea, for he would make a very poor show in a contest with a shark or a sword-fish; either of these would soon destroy his so-called impenetrable shield. They also excel him in point of

fierceness and swiftness of motion, two of the great attributes of the leviathan, as we have already seen.

From the extraordinary assertions made concerning the qualities of this leviathan, we are led to infer that there could be none so swift and so enduring as he; none so heartless, nor so fiery; none possessed of such a perfect shield; none so powerful. In fact it is said that, among all the creatures that trod the dust there is none like him.

These last words, as I have shown, cannot be limited, in their application, either to certain times or to certain creatures. They are most broad in their signification. All times and creatures are present before God. And when He says that, "There is nothing like him," or, "nothing similar to him, among all the creatures that tread the dust" or live upon the earth, then this monster must have been radically different from all the *created animals* that were then, or consequently, ever have been since.

We have this day in our midst just such a monster in our fiery iron-clad dragon. It far surpasses, by its unlimited power and capacity, by its great speed and endurance, by its peculiar nature and construction, and by its vast importance to mankind, any *animal* which was then in existence, or any power which, to our knowledge, has appeared on this earth up to the present time.

Not only does it seem evident that it is the

one alluded to, but it is clearly to be inferred from these words of the Lord to Job, "There is *nothing* like him," that no such a contrivance of power existed on this earth at that time. Moreover, in the last verse, it is also clearly indicated that no other "conception of power," will ever supersede it.

From the few remaining words of this verse there are still important conclusions to be drawn. I find the passage to mean: "He that is so constructed that he can fear nothing."

The Vulgate has: "He who is made that he may fear nothing."

It will be remembered that, in verse twenty-fourth, it is said that, "His heart is as firm as a stone," which I then interpreted as meaning that this monster had no heart at all, no feelings.

The present verse would seem to corroborate these views, for it plainly indicates that the leviathan is made in such a way that he can fear nothing.

A creature that cannot fear anything, or is made without the sense of fear, must have very blunted feelings, or, most probably, none at all. I do not know where such a monster could be found, unless it be indeed one with iron sinews.

The most ferocious and wild animals fear thunder and lightning. They all fear a blazing fire. All animals seem to have an innate knowledge and *fear* of their enemies. I am satisfied that all animals can be put to flight by one means or another. Yet this strangest of all monsters—

the leviathan—fears neither arrows nor spears, neither fire nor water. He seems to rejoice at the blows of a sledge-hammer, and at the poking of a fireman.

And the Vulgate tells us (verse 23) that even were the lightnings to strike him, not one of his limbs would move.

But this is not all. Possibly the reader has not taken notice that the leviathan is not said to have been *created* without fear, but that he is thus *made*, *constructed*.

It is the same word made use of, in the first verse of the description of behemoth.

In both instances the word has been rendered almost unanimously by the verb *to make*, and not *to create*.

The primary idea of the word, says Gesenius, lies probably in, *forming*, *shaping*, *cutting*. Latin, *facere*. Then *to construct*, *to build*.

This Hebrew word is not at all the same as the one made use of to denote *creation*. Neither can these words be used indiscriminately. Numerous instances throughout the Bible attest the truth of this. The word (בָּרָא) *bara* is the one used to denote *creation;* and it might be said to be sacred in its application to the creations of God, as it is the one made use of in Genesis, chap. i. 1.

This description of the behemoth and leviathan is such an extraordinary one, that I am satisfied no one will, henceforth, look upon it as a production from Job's own mind, but rather as

inspired throughout. In fact the book itself tells us that it was the Lord himself who spoke these words to Job.

Taking this for granted, then it was the Lord himself who made use of the expression *to make*, instead of *to create*.

Had it been a subsequent writer who had penned these Hebrew characters, according to his own ideas of an ancient tradition, he would most undoubtedly have looked upon such a wonderful monster as a direct creation of God,—as all others have—and, consequently, he would not have dared to make use of any expression which might have cast a doubt upon the origin of his description and of the creature itself. Therefore it is probable that he would have made use of the word *to create*, instead of, *to make*, *to construct*.

What has seemed doubtful in the eyes of those who looked upon these monsters as created wild animals, becomes, when viewed in this new light, positive evidence in favor of the direct inspiration of this wonderful description.

The leviathan then, according to the strict meaning of the original words, is not said to have been *created* in such a manner that *he can fear nothing*, but that he is *constructed*, or, *built* in such a manner that *he can fear nothing*.

Nothing could point out more clearly than this that the leviathan is not an animal, but a powerful motor and mechanical contrivance, which, of course, being constructed of iron or other such materials, cannot possess the sense of fear.

It might be asked, how then it is that in chap. xl. 1. The Lord says: "Behold, now, behemoth which *I have made* to be with thee."

To this I would answer that, in the same sense as intended here, the General claims to have won the victory, and the manufacturer to have made his goods, although each of these has but planned and provided the means for the result intended.

In the hands of the Great Architect of the universe we are, in things material, as his mechanics, his tools. He owns the whole earth. He has provided all the materials which are necessary to accomplish the end he has in view, and He claims the results as *his* and *of his own make.*

In all our improvements and discoveries, we are but utilizing the materials and developing the faculties which God has given us.

Behold, then, in this sense, behemoth and leviathan which the Lord, indeed, has provided for us.

That we might not forget this, He had it written, from the beginning, in His book.

HE IS KING OVER ALL CONCEPTIONS OF POWER.

Verse 34

אֵת	This one	Omne
כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ	all that is great, high,	sublime
יִרְאֶה	he will oversee, see to;	videt;
הוּא	He	Ipse est
מֶלֶךְ עַל־כָּל־	is king over all	rex super
בְּנֵי	children, progeny, conceptions	universos filios
שָׁחַץ׃	of fierceness, power, pride.	superbiæ.

"He beholdeth all high things; he is king over all the children of pride."

THIS is the last verse of this most extraordinary description and prophecy.

It will be found to equal, in its sublime conception and poetic beauty, any of those which have preceded it.

A few elucidations only will be necessary, that the proper application of the original words may be more fully understood. Most versions render: "He beholdeth all high things." The Vulgate and Septuagint have: "He beholdeth all that is sublime." How this could apply to a whale, or to a crocodile, will undoubtedly prove a mystery to the unprejudiced reader. Yet most

of our great writers on the subject labor hard to prove that it does. They have tried to explain away the difficulties of this passage by saying that the whale, or the crocodile, looks down with contempt upon all that is high and great; that he considers every thing as inferior to himself.

I am, indeed, at a loss to understand how our learned scholars ever arrived at such a conclusion.

In the first place, it is not quite evident that this is the primary meaning of the original words; nor is there anything in the context that tends to show that they should be taken in this sense, viz.; to look *down upon* all that is high, or great. Moreover, it must be admitted that, whatever may be meant here by *all that is high*, or *great*, must be taken in a very broad sense, and cannot be restricted to one or two objects to be seen in some one locality; or to a few things which might be visible to an inferior animal or class of animals.

As to what these *great* things are, may be surmised from what we find indicated in the second member of this verse, where this leviathan is said to be "king over all conceptions of power." In this sense it would be natural to suppose that this monster was well adapted to *see to* all such great thing as required great power, great strength, and that, naturally, as *king* over all conceptions of *power*, he may be said to *look up to* all that is high, great, or difficult to accomplish; or that he is present and *oversees* all great undertakings. From this would appear the propriety of his name.

Moreover the fact, that the leviathan is here personified, must not be lost sight of; and that consequently, in the high poetry of the language, he is said *to see*, *to oversee*, instead of being represented as actually *doing* or *performing* the hard work himself. So that really, the sense is that, this monster accomplishes *all great things*, great tasks, great undertakings.

If we wish to accept this passage in the sense of *to look down upon* all that is great, or difficult, we would have no trouble in finding a very suitable application of these words to our king of power, who seems to scorn the greatest and most difficult undertakings. They are indeed, to him, as nothing.

In the second place, even if the original had the meaning which our expositors attribute to it, there is not the faintest ground for asserting that a crocodile, or a whale, looks down with pride and contempt *upon all* that is high or great.

All that a crocodile has the opportunity of *looking down upon* is, the mud and mire which are beneath him.

This is far from being *all that is high* or *great*. Neither can these words apply to a whale; for all that it can *look down upon* is, the depth beneath it. This is not to *see all that is high*, but just the reverse.

Moreover it requires intelligence *to look down upon* anything with contempt. The crocodile, especially, does not seem to have much of this to spare.

You will soon perceive that it is only in the application of the original words to the steam engine in its various capacities, that we can understand their true meaning, and realize their sublime beauty. Verbatim it reads: "This one will see (or oversee) all that is great." Now, in fact, does not the steam engine, although in its infancy, visit almost all parts of the world; attend to all great expositions; come face to face with the greatest rulers of the earth, and mount up to the top of the highest mountains, or even bore through them if they prevent him from seeing other wonders beyond?

As I have shown, the same words have also the meaning of, *to oversee*, *to superintend all that is high*, *all that is great*, *difficult*. And here behold again our king of power. At the sound of his voice all gather around him to their work. He oversees, as it were, all great and difficult undertakings, for he himself manages the drill, the saw, and the sledge. He superintends the most herculean tasks. He sees to the erection of our greatest monuments. He is proud of his ability and strength, and never fails to be called upon in *all that is great* and difficult.

Yea, he laughs at the feeble efforts of both men and beasts. The greater the task he has to accomplish the prouder he feels.

His self-reliance is as enduring as the strength and thickness of his shields.

These, indeed, are qualities worthy of a leviathan, and of an inspired pen.

The second part of this verse is not as easily understood as the first.

Most versions follow the Vulgate which renders it: "He himself is king over all children of pride."

I believe that the expression *children of pride* should be taken in the widest acceptation of the term, and not restricted to *the* children of pride. In the latter sense it would have to be taken as intended to refer to some special nation, or class of people already mentioned, or well-known. This does not seem to be the case. Then again, in strict conformity to the wording of the original, we would have to suppose, in this case, that this monster was not a beast or thing of power, but actually a king who ruled over *the children of pride*. This is, evidently, preposterous.

Consequently the inference, that this description is not intended to be taken literally.

But who are these *children of pride?* The Chaldee supposes that the *offspring of fishes* is here alluded to, as the leviathan was looked upon as a terrible sea monster.

Some suppose that by *the children af pride* are meant the Egyptians, as the *crocodile* was one of their principal divinities.

But even admitting that the *crocodile* was one of their divinities, is it certain that Job alludes here to *a crocodile*?

Can it be shown that a crocodile, or any of the Egyptian divinities or kings, ever bore the name of *leviathan?*

The reader has noticed that throughout this description the leviathan has been constantly represented as the most formidable and fearless, the most powerful and invulnerable of all monsters, either on land or on sea. Would it not then be more natural to suppose that, if he is to be made a king—figuratively speaking—he should be proclaimed such over that class to which he belongs; the same as it is said of the lion that he is *the king of beasts*, but not of birds, nor of the fishes of the sea?

By *children of pride*, then, would be more especially meant, all those of his class over which he predominates by his great superiority in strength and power. In fact the original words (בְּנֵי שָׁחַץ) have also the meaning of *sons of strength*.

We have seen that the leviathan is of a most fiery and imperious nature; that he is proud of his enormous strength, and that he seems conscious that "might has made its dwelling place within his neck." His self-confidence and stubbornness are so great that "he fears nothing," not even the lightnings nor the thunderbolts from heaven.

Surely such a one is well entitled to the name of king over all the progeny of the fiery, and proud, and strong-necked ones of his class, and even of any other that may tread the dust.

If it be our fearless, and powerful, and fiery monster, which is here referred to,—and I hope to have conclusively established this fact from

the beginning—then these *children of pride*, over which this monster is said to be king, must refer to our various modes of developing power.

The meaning, then, of this passage would be, that the steam engine, as a motive power, predominates, or, is king over all other conceptions of power.

What a grand and sublime denouement to this ever-famous description; its hero is finally crowned and proclaimed king over all those of his race.

"Non est potestas super terram
quae compararetur ei." (Vulgate.)

Job is not the only one among the sacred writers who makes mention of the leviathan. We find it also referred to in Isaia, and in the Psalms; and I can see no good reason for supposing that these inspired writes had any other monster in view than the one described in the book of Job; otherwise, I could not understand why they should describe him as the leviathan. Many writers are of contrary opinion, but I can easily perceive that it is because they did not understand the true reference of the original one mentioned in Job. If my views be correct they will undoubtedly help to throw light on the great and unsolved difficulties we meet with in these new passages, and possibly reveal to us that certain prophecies, made in connection with this leviathan, refer to these very days instead, as heretofore supposed, to those of Pharaoh.

In Ps. lxxiv. 14, is found, according to most versions, the following passage: "Thou breakest the heads of the leviathan in pieces, thou gavest him *to be* meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness." This passage, as it now appears in the Hebrew, is, undoubtedly, a most difficult one to understand.

Nowhere in Job have we found it mentioned that the leviathan had more heads than one. Commentators, therefore, have been greatly perplexed with this, apparently, insurmountable difficulty, which could not be solved by any of their expressed views concerning the identity of the one mentioned in Job.

What must we now infer from these words of the Psalmist? According to the views I have already expressed, this leviathan is the same one mentioned in Job; and, as I hope to have shown, none other than our own fiery monster. Literally, this one has no *heads*. Consequently I look upon the word *heads* as being intended here in a figurative sense, the same as the numerous expressions met with in this description.

As to the word rendered *thou breakest in pieces;* it has, primarily, the meaning of *to shatter*, *to break*, or *divide in many sections*, yet not so as to separate entirely the parts thus broken.

This peculiarity of the word is of vast importance to us in this instance, as will be soon perceived. Thus, I render this passage: "Thou breakest (or, dividest) in many sections the heads of the leviathan."

In this sense, these *heads* may be easily understood of our various branches and systems of railways which are, in one sense, *broken into many sections* or, divided the one from the other, yet not entirely separated. Railroad companies are generally interested in centering together at various points, thus forming, as it were, a united system of railways, yet *broken up* into many sections. Thus, indeed, the leviathan may be said to have many heads.

Again, these various companies may well be said to be so many *heads* of the same fiery monster, as he is the chief motor among them all. That these heads of the leviathan may refer to various railroad companies, seems to gain strength also from the words of Job, chap. xl. 6: "*Companies* will feast upon him."

We might take also another view of the application of the words, "Thou dashest in pieces the heads of the leviathan," by supposing that the writer actually saw, in vision, two leviathans dashing one another's heads in pieces.

This fact is, at least, quite possible, and would be here an astonishing forecast of an almost daily occurrence on our railroads, viz., a collision, where two powerful and almost indestructible locomotives dash one another's heads in pieces. Although this would seem, at first sight, to be the most natural interpretation of the original, yet this meaning would not agree as well with the sentiments expressed in the balance of the verse, which seem to demand that this monster

of power should, indeed, *branch off* into various directions, in order to fulfill his great mission of supplying food to people inhabiting unproductive and desert places; a mission which he could not accomplish were the Lord bent upon dashing his head in pieces.

As to the second hemistich of the above verse, it has equally puzzled the most learned exegetists. Some suppose that here allusion is had to Pharaoh compared with the leviathan, viz., the crocodile. Others suppose that some enormous sea monster having the form of a sea-serpent is here meant. But I cannot see the slightest reason for these suppositions.

I do not know that Pharaoh's name has ever been mentioned in connection with *the leviathan*, although it has been with that of other monsters. Then, if this leviathan referred to a marine monster or serpent, how could his dead carcass be said to have been intended *to be meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness;* for a wilderness is generally understood to be a region uncultivated and uninhabited by human beings? If it be claimed that the people of a dry and sandy desert are here meant, then this leviathan cannot be a sea monster, for there are few rivers and fewer seas to be found in the midst of a dry and sandy desert.

Moreover how could such a terrible and invulnerable monster, as Job represents this leviathan to be, ever be captured by the weak and primitive implements of a wild people?

On the other hand, it cannot be supposed that the Lord here intended, as some claim, that these people should live on the dead carcass of a huge serpent, whose remains *might be* cast ashore. Finally I would ask, when and where did the Lord ever break in pieces the *heads* of the crocodile or of some sea monster and give his body "to be meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness"?

The people supposed to be alluded to here could not have been the Jews. They never would have eaten the flesh of such a monster even alive, much less after he had been thus mutilated and cast ashore.

It is evident that, to this day, no interpretation of the leviathan has solved the difficulties of this passage.

Now, if we refer to the original Hebrew, we will find that the strictest and most plausible version of it, is: "Thou givest this one food *for* the people of desert places, (dry places)," which is quite a different thing from, "thou gavest *him* to be *meat to* the people of the wilderness."

My rendering would, undoubtedly, have seemed an absurdity to those who saw nothing in the leviathan but a crocodile, or a huge sea-serpent. But, taking it as referring to our modern monster of power, and our vast systems of railways, we can at once realize the propriety and beauty of the original; for, indeed, our railroads carry an abundance of food and a variety of products to people who inhabit dry and unproductive lands, or places where various commodities of life cannot be had.

By this means the abundance of fertile countries is transported rapidly and economically into others less favored. Therefore, in all truth it can be said of our monster of power that, the Lord Himself furnishes him food *for* the people of desert or impoverished places.

It is important that we should take notice that the author of these Psalms expresses, in the above verse, the very same idea which Job does in chap. xli. 22, viz., "Distress fleeth at his presence," which means that wherever the railroads penetrate, the distress or wants of those localities is at once relieved, yea, it even *flees* away.

All will agree that the above words of Job, when viewed in their possible application to our great common carrier, and to the rapidity of our steam transit, reveal a beauty and poetry unexcelled; but that this suddenly fades when the words are forced to apply to anything else.

Again, in chap. xli. 10, we find this same idea of *food*, *provisions*, etc., being brought to this monster, thus expressed: "Indeed, they will bring forth unto him the produce of the mountains."

From all this I would conclude that, the leviathan of the Psalmist and that of Job, are identical; and that my views concerning the nature of this monster must be correct, since the same interpretation solves so readily the new difficulties we meet with in this passage, and agrees so perfectly with the requirements of the original text.

Again, in Ps. civ. 26, we read: "There the ships go to and fro, *and* leviathan that one which thou hast formed to sport therein."

The idea expressed here by the Psalmist is, that the Lord had *formed* or so *devised* this monster that it could sport in the sea.

The primary meaning of (יָצַר) *yatsar*, is not *to create*, but *to form*, *to fashion*, and it is to be taken here in this sense. If any other meaning was intended here it would be most probably that of *to restrain*, *to confine*, from the root (עָצַר) *atsar*. And the idea would be that, although this monster was a most dangerous one, yet the Lord had provided that he should be so *restrained* and *confined* that men might sport (בּוֹ) with him in safety.

No one will deny that this passage agrees, in a wonderful manner, with the various purposes of pleasure and sport to which the steam engine of our days is adapted; and with the progress which has been made in so restraining and securely confining its dangerous forces, that men now sport with him in safety.

Here the inspired writer would seem to refer to a steamship, or a steam yacht built for pleasure; whilst, in the previous quotation, he refers to our railroads.

This, and the previous verse of the Psalmist, prove that this monster must have been one capable of living and sporting freely in mid-ocean, and that, consequently, he could not have been, exclusively, a river animal, such as the crocodile.

In reference to this same leviathan, another very startling passage, both to me and to the whole world, is found in the book of Isaia, chap. xxvii. 1.

That which renders this passage of peculiar interest to us is, its evident association with prophecies of extraordinary events which are to happen at, or about, the time when something unexpected will take place concerning this same leviathan.

If the latter be our modern engine of power, then we may expect to witness the fulfilment of some of these prophecies.

The passage above referred to is a very difficult one, consequently it has been variously rendered and interpreted.

In most English versions it reads as follows: "In that day the Lord, with his sore and great and strong sword, shall punish leviathan the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea."

Now, instead of "*with* his sore and great and strong sword," (בְּחַרְבּוֹ) ; I consider that we should render here, "*in* his unyielding and great and strong sword." The prefix *beth* having both meanings. And that instead of "leviathan *the crooked* serpent," we should read, "leviathan *a serpent* turning (or revolving) rapidly;" for such is also the meaning of the word, according to our best lexicons.

It is also evident that the expression *to punish*, does not render the meaning intended here by the Hebrew word. In the original the word (פָּקַד) *pakad*, rendered *to punish*, means primarily, *to light upon*, or, *to strike against* a thing, in the

same sense in which we often say *he lit upon it*, or, *he struck it*, for *he discovered it*. Then it means *to visit*, *to review*. Then *to visit with punishment*.

I am satisfied that here the original word should be taken in its favorable sense, viz., *to visit*, *to review a second time;* or *to light upon*, *to strike against* a thing in the sense of *discovering* it.

As to the preposition (עַל) *al* it should be rendered here, *concerning*, and not *upon*.

So far, then, this would reveal to us that the Lord, instead of punishing or killing this leviathan, will, on the contrary, cause *a review* to be made *concerning* this monster; or, will cause some one *to strike against* him or *discover* him as if by chance; and this discovery is to be made *in*, or, *by means of* a something here (figuratively) called, "His unyielding and great and strong sword."

Before explaining the meaning and reference of this great sword, it will first be necessary to elucidate the balance of this verse, as evidently an error has crept in which, if unexplained, would cast a doubt on the correctness of the meaning which I have attributed to that which precedes it. I refer to the expression (וְהָרָג) *veharag*, rendered: "And he shall slay." The entire passage is translated almost universally, as follows: "And he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea." According to the present Hebrew editions it reads: (יְהָרַג אֶת־הַתַּנִּין אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם:) *veharag ath-hattannin asher bayyam*. After a tedious in-

vestigation of this and other passages, I am thoroughly convinced that the word (תַּנִּין) *tannin* means *a fiery monster*, or *one giving forth smoke repeatedly*, from (תַּן) *tan* furnace, and (נוּר) *nour*, fire; or (תָּנַן) *tanan*, Syriac and Chaldaic—*to smoke;* hence *oven*, *furnace*.

Undoubtedly reference is had here to a monster full of fire and repeatedly emitting smoke like a furnace, and that it goes (or is) in the sea. It seems evident that the steamship is here meant. In this light, then, it would be very doubtful that the Prophet Isaia ever intended to say that the Lord would *slay* (הָרַג) the steamship.

Let us therefore leave out, for a moment, the doubtful word (הָרַג) *harag*, *to slay*.

Then this entire verse would read: "In that day the Lord, in his unyielding and great and strong sword, shall make a review (or cause a review to be made) concerning leviathan, a serpent passing through swiftly, and concerning leviathan, a serpent turning rapidly . . . . this same one *is* the fiery monster that *is* in the sea." No one will deny that, so far, this is a most literal translation; and that leviathan must be a fiery monster that goes on land as well as in the sea; the same as described in the book of Job. This swift, fiery and self-turning leviathan, says Isaia, is the very same fiery monster that is in the sea. This is just what our modern monster of power is. As a locomotive, with a train of coaches, it is as a huge serpent passing

through swiftly and turning itself rapidly. As a marine engine, it perambulates through the sea with ease and rapidity, a veritable fiery monster, smoking like a furnace.

To complete the elucidation of this difficult verse there remain now but two points to solve:

1. The meaning of the Hebrew word (הָרַג) *harag*.

2. The meaning of that great and wonderful *sword of God*.

As to the word (הָרַג) *harag*, rendered *to slay*, I am thoroughly convinced that it originally read (חָרַג) *charag*, and that the letter (ח) *cheth* was mistaken for the letter (ה) *he*. This change might be due to the difficulty of distinguishing—in an old and partially obliterated manuscript—between these two letters, as the one naturally differs but very little from the other.

Taking (חָרַג) *charag*, as the original word it would then mean *to leap*, *to be in constant motion* or *trepidation*. Applied to the leviathan this would indicate that he leaps continually, in other words that he is continually in motion running without ever seeming to stop.

Assuredly this is most wonderfully true of our steam locomotive which runs hundreds of miles without stopping; in fact, the only limit to its course, is that of supplies.

When at full speed the up and down motion of its ponderous connecting rods gives it, indeed, the appearance of a monster continually leaping forward.

We have seen that Job, in his description of the behemoth, (chap. xl. 17,) calls these very same connecting rods, *his leaping parts*, or, *his thighs*. It is in fact by means of these, in connection with the steam-chest, that the steam engine propels itself, or sets ponderous machinery in motion.

There remains now but one more secret concerning the reference of this passage; it is the secret of the meaning of that mighty sword, which the prophet says, is the unyielding, and great, and strong sword of God. To what can it refer?

It is not the sword of the leviathan, but that of God.

Most commentators pass it over in silence, as if fearing to venture an opinion.

A few reflections, however, may help us to solve this problem also.

In the first place, it seems reasonable to suppose that this *sword* is to be understood in a figurative sense; for to assert that God has, literally, *such* a sword, and that he employs it in slaying the monsters of the deep, would be the height of absurdity.

Among the many things which might be figuratively called *the sword of God*, I believe that the most unyielding (or unchangeable) and greatest, and strongest is, THE WORD OF GOD, or THE HOLY BIBLE. Indeed St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians (vi. 17,) says: "The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

Furthermore, in this sense, we can recognize

the force of the expressions that this SWORD or WORD OF GOD, is unyielding, or rather unchangeable, and great, and strong. Now if I be correct in asserting that the Holy Bible is the sword above mentioned, then it would have to be *in* this great book that the Lord, in that day, would cause "a review to be made" concerning the nature of this leviathan.

And what is this review which you have now before you? May it not be the very fulfillment of this extraordinary prophecy?

Most assuredly this is an astonishing and unexpected revelation to me, for it finds me endeavoring to do the very thing that this prophecy foretells shall be done.

I notice also that the prophet foretells that, at about that time *a great trumpet shall be blown*, and that many who were ready to perish, shall be converted to the true faith and shall worship the Lord in His Holy Church, (Isa. xxvii. 13).

Undoubtedly many will now read with astonishment this important and difficult verse. On my part I must acknowledge that, had I not seen a locomotive and train of coaches I could never have made any sense out of the original words. The thought naturally occurs to us here, how could Isaia pen such a correct description of our modern locomotive, and at the same time observe that the same monster could travel through the sea, unless he wrote each word under direct inspiration, or saw in a vision, and completely understood, the working of our modern engines.

Isaia is even more lucid than Job, for he plainly tells us here that this swift-fleeing leviathan is the same fiery monster that is in the sea. Job, speaking of the leviathan, says, (chap. xli. 31, 32): "He maketh the deep to boil like a pot . . . ; He maketh a path to shine after him."

Undoubtedly we have now the solution of Job's mysterious *crooked serpent*, chap. xxvi. 13, for Isaia makes use of the same words in describing the leviathan, viz., (נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ) *nachash barach, a swift fleeing serpent, one passing through swiftly, like a bolt.*

Thus these most wonderful prophecies are made clear to us, and I feel confident that we now understand what the prophet Isaia referred to when he said: "In that day the Lord, in his unyielding, and great, and strong s-word, shall cause a review to be made concerning leviathan, a serpent passing through swiftly, and concerning leviathan, a serpent turning rapidly and continually in motion; this is the same fiery monster that is in the sea."

AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM.

LITERAL TRANSLATION

OF

THE HEBREW VERSES

CONCERNING

BEHEMOTH AND LEVIATHAN.

JOB.—CHAP. XL.

V. 15. Behold now *one* with great heat,
Which I made *to be* with thee;
He will consume fodder as well as cattle do.

V. 16. Behold also, his strength depends on his loins;
And his power is within
The encircling parts of his belly.

V. 17. His tail will set upright like a cedar;
The ligaments of his thighs
Will be clamped together.

V. 18. His *hollow* bones *are* tubes of brass;
His *solid* bones *are* bars of iron
As if hammered out.

V. 19. He is a masterpiece of the methods of power;
He that maketh him will apply *unto him*
His sword *of destruction*.

V. 20. Surely they will bring forth unto him
The products of the mountains,
And then the beasts of the field will wear away.

V. 21. He will rest beneath light shelters
And within a covering
Of *fibrous* reeds and clay.

V. 22. Thin shadings will cover his shelter;
Willows of the valley
Will enclose him roundabout.

V. 23. Behold, he will absorb a river and will not fret;
He will trust though a Jordan
Should rush forth over its border.

V. 24. He will gather it up in his fountains
By means of traps,
And with a perforated nozzle.

LEVIATHAN.

CHAPTER XLI.

V. 1. Thou wilt extend leviathan with a hook,
Or with a snare which thou wilt cause
His tongue to press down.

V. 2. Wilt thou *not* place a ring in his nostrils,
And pierce through his cheeks with a staff?

V. 3. Will he make repeated supplications unto thee?
Or will he utter soft tones unto thee?

V. 4. Will he make a covenant with thee,
That thou mayest take him for a servant for ever?

V. 5. Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?
Or wilt thou make him fast to thy maidens?

V. 6. Companies will feast upon him;
They will share him among speculators.

V. 7. Wilt thou *not* fill his skin with booths,
And his head with a cabin of fishermen?

V. 8. Place thy hand upon him;
Be mindful of the battling forces,
And thou wilt add no further questions.

V. 9. Behold, his confidence being deceived,
Will not at once his mighty form
Be spread asunder.

V. 10. There is none so bold that he will stir him up;
And *none* who will then place
Himself before his face.

V. 11. Who will precede this one
And continue on in safety?
Under the whole heaven none, unless himself.

V. 12. I will not pass in silence his members,
Nor the matter of *his* great powers,
Nor the beauty of his equipment.

V. 13. Who can strip off the facings of his covering?
Who can penetrate between
The double lap of his binding?

V. 14. Who can force open the doors of his facings?
The circuits of his teeth are formidable.

V. 15. His strength *depends on* courses of shields
Closed up tightly with a seal.

V. 16. They will join one upon another, that a
Hiss of air shall not escape *from* between them.

V. 17. One will cleave fast to another;
They will be caught together
That they cannot be sundered.

V. 18. A light will cause his sneezingsto shine,
And his eyes will be as the eyelashes
Of the morning.

V. 19. Out of his mouth will leap forth
Flaming torches, and glowing sparks
Will slip themselves away.

V. 20. From his nostrils will issue forth smoke
As from a boiling pot or caldron.

V. 21. His inhaling will vivify burning coals;
And a flame will leap forth from his mouth.

V. 22. Might will abide within his neck,
And a desolate place
Will dance *with joy* at his presence.

V. 23. The separable parts of his flesh
Are connected together,
All will be made fast upon him,
Nothing will be shaky.

V. 24. His heart will be indurated
Similar to a stone, and will be made firm
As a piece of the lower rocks.

V. 25. When at his full rage the most courageous
Will fear, lest, from accidents
They should miss their way.

V. 26. From dryness rendering him furious,
He will not have power to withhold;
The curved vault being caused to break up,
And also the armor.

V. 27. He will esteem iron as straw,
And brass as rotten wood.

V. 28. The archer will not make this one flee;
Missiles *of war* will be turned unto him as chaff.

V. 29. The *strokes of a* hammer will be esteemed as chaff;
And he will rejoice at the poking of the fireman.

V. 30. His underparts are hewed *timbers*
Of the craftsman;
He will spread an embankment upon the mire.

V. 31. He will cause deep *places*
To become as a boiling pot;
He will make the sea to appear
Like boiling ointment.

V. 32. His hinderparts will cause a path to shine;
One will think the deep to be growing gray.

V. 33. There is nothing upon earth comparable to him,
He that is *so* constructed that he can fear nothing.

V. 34. He will oversee all that is great;
He is indeed King
Over all conceptions of power.

PSALMS—CHAP. LXXIV. 14.

Thou dividest into many sections
The heads of leviathan;
Thou givest him food
For the people of desert places.

CHAP. CIV. 26.

There the ships go to and fro, and leviathan
That one which thou hast formed
To sport therein.

ISAIA—CHAP. XXVII. 1.

In that day the Lord, in his unyielding, and great, and strong sword, shall cause a review to be made concerning leviathan, a serpent passing through swiftly; and concerning leviathan, a serpent turning rapidly and continually in motion; this is the same fiery monster that is in the sea.

FINIS.

16462YH LIA 1068
07-10-03 32180 MC

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01276 2276

DATE DUE

DEC 1 [illegible] 2004		

GAYLORD #3523PI Printed in USA